

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE ROLES AND FUNCTIONS
OF PARENT ADVISORY COUNCILS SERVING
SPANISH-ENGLISH BILINGUAL PROJECTS
FUNDED UNDER ESEA TITLE VII,

by

Horberto Cruz, Jr.

Dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in

Educational Administration

APPROVED

Donald K. Sharpes, Co-Chairman

Wayne M. Worner, Co-Chairman

Wayne H. White

Joseph Intermaggio

Martha G. Wilmeth

June, 1978

Blacksburg, Virginia

LD
5655
V856
1978
C78
c.2

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated with all my love to my wife, Anita Louise Cruz, and my daughter, Maria Christina Cruz. It is my hope and prayer that they be the first to receive any benefits which may come as a result of the study and that they always rejoice in this accomplishment which was made possible with God's blessing.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The researcher expresses his sincerest appreciation and gratitude to the following individuals for making the completion of this research study possible, as well as the realization of a dream.

Donald K. Sharpes who initiated the topic, had the patience, diligence and willingness to guide the researcher to the successful completion of the study. His knowledge of education and overwhelming compassion for people are surpassed only by his personal kindness to the researcher.

Wayne M. Worner whose friendship, assistance in formulating the design and personal guidance will always be remembered.

Wayne H. White whose association as a professor and friend from the onset of the doctoral program was of great inspiration.

Joseph Intermaggio whose insights into education, economics and politics were instrumental to this study, as was his personal interest and encouragement.

Maria Wilmeth who supported the researcher, not only with encouragements, but with literature relevant to the study.

Richard Johnson, whose expertise in statistics made the analysis of the data possible, will not be forgotten.

My parents whose prayers and love made a dream come true.

And to my dear wife Anita whose endless love, total sacrifice, compassionate understanding and gentle encouragement made this a worthwhile endeavor.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION TO THE FEDERAL ROLE IN EDUCATION	1
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	7
NEED OF THE STUDY	13
PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	15
HYPOTHESES	16
DEFINITIONS	17
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	18
SUMMARY	20
2. REVIEW OF MINORITY PARTICIPATION, FEDERAL LEGISLATION, AND PARENT ADVISORY COUNCILS	22
COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION	22
PARTICIPATION BY MINORITIES	24
LEGISLATION ASSISTING MINORITIES	26
THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964	32
THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965	33
THE PASSAGE OF ESEA TITLE VII	35
PARTICIPATION AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	40

	Page
THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL	45
THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON BILINGUAL EDUCATION	46
THE PARENT ADVISORY COUNCIL	47
ORGANIZATION OF ADVISORY COUNCILS	51
FUNCTIONS OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL	55
ROLES OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL	57
SUMMARY	59
3. PROCEDURES	63
THE INSTRUMENT	64
PILOT TEST	67
RESEARCH SUBJECTS	68
ADMINISTRATION OF THE INSTRUMENT	70
COLLECTION OF THE DATA	71
TREATMENT OF THE DATA	71
SUMMARY	74
4. PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF DATA	76
GENERAL DATA	76
DATA ANALYSIS	77
DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION ON COUNCILS	79
RANKINGS OF ROLES AND FUNCTIONS	121
AGREEMENT ON THE RANKING OF ROLES AND FUNCTIONS	130
DISCUSSION OF HYPOTHESES	137
DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS	148

	Page
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND OBSERVATIONS	150
SUMMARY	150
CONCLUSIONS	155
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	159
OBSERVATIONS	160
BIBLIOGRAPHY	164
APPENDIXES	
A. QUESTIONNAIRE	170
B. BILINGUAL PROJECTS PARTICIPATING IN STUDY	176
C. COVER LETTER TO RESEARCH SUBJECTS	178
VITA	183
ABSTRACT	

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Numbers and Percentages of Distributed and Returned Questionnaires By Position of Respondents	78
2. Numbers and Percentages of Male and Female Respondents	80
3. Distribution of Respondents by Position and Gender	81
4. Age Levels of Respondents	83
5. Distribution of Respondents by Position and Age Level	84
6. Education Level of Respondents	85
7. Distribution of Respondents by Position and Education Level	86
8. Ethnic Background of Respondents	88
9. Distribution of Respondents by Position by Ethnic Background	89
10. Spanish-English Bilingual Ability of Respondents	91
11. Distribution of Respondents by Position by Spanish-English Bilinguals	92
12. Ethnic Background of Parent Advisory Council	94
13. Method of Selection of Chairpersons	96
14. Method of Selection of Advisory Council Members	97
15. Number of Parent Advisory Council Members	98

	Page
16. Terms of Parent Advisory Council Members	100
17. Relative Number of Males on Parent Advisory Council	101
18. Half or more of PAC Parents with Children in Bilingual Program	103
19. Length of Orientation Program for Parent Advisory Council	104
20. Existence of Formal School Board Policy Statement or Administrative Recognition of Parent Advisory Council	105
21. The Limits of Authority for Parent Advisory Council Are Specified By Local School Board or Superintendent	106
22. Parent Advisory Council Existence Prior to Federal Bilingual Education Funding	108
23. Existence of Parent Advisory Council on Bilingual Education Prior To Preparation of Federal Proposal	109
24. Respondents' Perceptions of How Parent Advisory Council Functions	111
25. Where Parent Advisory Councils Meet	112
26. How Often Parent Advisory Councils Meet	114
27. When Parent Advisory Councils Meet	115
28. Parent Advisory Council Participation In The Development of the Agenda for Meetings	117
29. Parent Advisory Council Keeping Minutes	118
30. How Decisions Are Made	119
31. Notification To Community of PAC Meetings	120
32. Respondents' Perceptions of the Relative Importance of Roles of the PAC by Rank	122

	Page
33. Respondents' Perceptions of Functions in the Program Area of Planning by Rank	125
34. Respondents' Perceptions of Functions in the Program Area of Implementation by Rank	127
35. Respondents' Perceptions of Functions in the Program Area of Evaluation by Rank	129
36. Validation of Respondents' Ranking of Each Role	131
37. Validation of Respondents' Ranking of Each Function in Planning	132
38. Validation of Respondents' Ranking of Each Function in Implementation	133
39. Validation of Respondents' Ranking of Each Function in Evaluation	134

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

In recent years there has been a concerted national effort to provide equal educational opportunities for all children in public schools. Because of the failure of some local and state governments to produce needed monies to effectively accommodate the rise in selected student populations and meet certain educational needs, the Congress has intervened with federal grants.

The public school system in America is complex with responsibilities shared by the local, the state and the federal governments. The local government, retains the basic responsibility of building schools, employing teachers, assigning pupils to appropriate classrooms, developing the curriculum and inservice programs for school personnel. These responsibilities can be classified as the operation of public elementary and secondary schools.

The state governments are required by their respective constitutions to establish and maintain free public education. The state, therefore, has the legal responsibility which the local government must carry out. Even with this legal responsibility there are limitations to what states can provide to educational development. One of the most common problems causing inequalities in education is the tax revenue of most states. Another problem is that policies which include civil rights directives are not usually implemented with enough conviction to be of any real benefit to those affected by the lack of civil rights protection.

The role of the federal government in public education has usually been supplementary with guidelines and financial assistance. A national point of view focusing on educational problems and compensation for insufficient tax revenues are the important contributions which only the federal government can provide. The federal government has taken the initiative needed in order to equalize educational opportunities in all states.

According to Sharpes, Congress has a long history of involvement in education which developed in ". . .five distinct stages: (1) land, (2) veterans and manpower, (3) food and agriculture, (4) federal schools and property, and (5) human and civil rights."¹ Congress initiated its role in education when it enacted the land ordinances of 1785 and 1787 which required that land be designated for schools. Lands for educational purposes were also donated by Congress under numerous land grant acts.²

Congress then shifted its emphasis from assisting schools with grants of land to directly assisting the individual. "The largest and most effective program initiated by the federal government . . .has been the GI Bill,"³ states Sharpes. The GI Bill is representative of the type of legislation enacted by Congress during the second state of "Veteran and Manpower."

¹Donald K. Sharpes, "The Evolution of Federal Education Legislation," Education and The Federal Government (New York: Longmens, Inc., In Press), p. 10.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., p. 11.

The third stage reflected a national concern for more food production. Land grants were made by Congress to colleges, with the intent that the development of advanced agricultural techniques would aid farmers. The "Food and Agriculture" stage developed in 1874 with "an act to encourage the establishment of public marine schools and ended in 1954 with the National School Lunch Act."⁴

Aside from the military academies established by the federal government, the Smith-Hughes Act which established federal vocational education schools, was the first instance of federal money appropriated for a specific education program. The Smith-Hughes Act of the fourth stage, "Federal Schools and Property," has been of vital importance, Sharpes points out:

The Smith-Hughes Act established the principle and precedent that the federal government could operate and maintain a specialized school to meet a national need where the local school was unwilling or unable.⁵

The fifth stage, "Human and Civil Rights," has in it a series of acts which were legislated by Congress, with the intent to assure freedom for all citizens in the United States. The "Human and Civil Rights" stage first developed in 1866 when Congress enacted a law to "protect all persons in the United States in their civil rights and to furnish the means of their vindication."⁶ It

⁴Ibid., p. 14.

⁵Ibid., p. 15.

⁶Ibid., p. 16.

was not, however, until the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that full rights for all citizens was made explicit by federal law. Sharpes states that:

Stage V in this evolutionary pattern, concerned with human and civil rights, was an effort of, and outgrowth from, educational impact from the federal government on the individual.⁷

With the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), Congress continued the precedent set by the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, and authorized grants to be paid directly to local school systems to improve the school program for all children. The ESEA was intended to expand and improve the quality of selected educational programs.

Originally the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was aimed at bringing better educational opportunities to the children who were disadvantaged because of poverty conditions in the United States. Congress further defined the term "disadvantaged" when it recognized the needs of linguistic minorities and amended the ESEA of 1965 by passing Title VII, better known as the Bilingual Education Act of 1968.⁸

Important to linguistic minorities, as well as to other minorities, were the mandates on citizen participation in federal

⁷ Ibid., p. 19.

⁸ Title VII - Bilingual Education Act of 1968 was passed "In recognition of the special educational needs of the large numbers of children of limited English-speaking ability in the United States . . . For the purpose of this title, "children of limited English-speaking ability" means children who come from environments where the dominant language is other than English." Elementary and Secondary Educational Amendments of 1967, Statutes at Large 81, (1968), 783.

programs which Congress legislated. The term "participation" was first widely used in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. This Act made provisions for maximum participation by all citizens whenever feasible. Citizens now had a voice in some of the policies which directly affected their lives.⁹

Citizen participation in educational programs had its major inception with federal programs like ESEA Title I and Headstart. Local school districts had to create parent advisory councils in order to be eligible to receive federal funds. These parent advisory councils were to assist local school officials in the planning, implementation and evaluation of the specific federally funded program.¹⁰

According to Clasby, the goal of "maximum feasible participation" was not clearly stated in the educational legislation. The exceptions, of course, were some of the provisions in Title I, which provided for citizen involvement.¹¹ Clasby criticizes the regulations developed by the federal government for advisory councils, because "a commitment was announced without attention to implementation, follow-through, or documentation of results."¹² Clasby clarified this by

⁹William B. Dickenson, Jr., ed., "Health, Education and Welfare," Congress and the Nation, II, 1965-68, (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Service, 1969), 663.

¹⁰Peggy Odell Gonder, Linking Schools and the Community (Arlington, Va.: National School Public Relations Association), 1970 p. 6.

¹¹Miriam Clasby, "The Community Voice In Public Education," Social Policy, November/December 1977, p. 74.

¹²Ibid.

the statement:

Federal regulations for councils, with precise requirements for membership emphasize structure rather than function. Councils have the right to convene, to receive information and to sign off on proposals for funding. There are few, if any, provisions for technical assistance, for monitoring or evaluating the activities, or for funding.¹³

With citizen participation widespread in the United States, there is evident variety in the quality of participation. A three-year National Institute of Education study of citizen participation revealed key factors which undermined the quality of citizen participation. One particular weakness, according to the study was that officials:

Concentrate on structures and ignore functions. Create new groups and focus attention on numbers: how many members, how often they meet, etc. Never clarify roles, rights, responsibilities. Give these groups no power.¹⁴

Davies best relates the importance of power to citizen participation by stating:

Participation without power is demoralizing for an informed constituency, leading to cynicism and public mistrust of the education establishment. Without adopting a coherent policy for participation with incentives for local professionals to comply with it, state and federal policy makers will be embarking on a venture producing more harm than good.¹⁵

Davies further emphasized the importance of this concept by saying that it:

. . . is particularly significant when applied to those who are often badly served by the schools--the urban and rural poor,

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴Don Davies, Miriam Clasby and Brian Powers, "The Plight of Citizens," Compact, Autumn, 1977, p. 17.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 21

¹⁶Don Davies, "Citizen participation in schools: a network of illusions," Citizen Action in Education, V, No. 1 (January, 1978), 1.

minorities, and working class whites--who now have the least power in shaping school policies.¹⁶

The following section describes specifically the problems with the legislation and administrative policies dealing with parent advisory councils in bilingual programs. Recommendations for parent/community involvement will be described according to the National Advisory Council on Bilingual Education.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Bilingual Education funded under ESEA Title VII provides for parent and community involvement in "all" aspects of program planning, implementation and evaluation. Parent advisory councils have been the vehicles for this involvement in bilingual programs.

In the Bilingual Education Act of 1968, there is no language which mandates parent/community participation through an advisory council, committee or other group. It does, however, state:

Applications for grants under title may be approved by the Commissioner only if. . .the program set forth in the application is consistent, with criteria established by the Commissioner. . .¹⁷

This gave the Commissioner the right to develop criteria which local and state educational agencies were required to meet in order to qualify for Title VII funds. In 1971, criteria for eligibility of Title VII funds were printed in the Manual for Project Applicants and Grantees. The Manual did not mandate parent advisory councils, which is evident by the word "should," such wording is a

¹⁷Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967, Statutes at Large 81, (1968), 786.

suggestion rather than a regulation. The Manual states:

A project advisory group which consists of parents and community representatives should be formed before the project proposed is prepared and should continue to be involved at all stages of the project's development and operation.¹⁸

The Manual further emphasizes the importance of community support and suggests that without such support goals cannot be properly achieved and plans will be incomplete.¹⁹

Evidently, there were oversights concerning parent participation in bilingual education projects. Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I 1965 had required parent/community involvement in its educational programs and ESEA Title VII, three years later, made no mention of such participation. Proposals were put forth concerning participation by groups such as Aspira and La Raza which represented Spanish-speakers. The same concern was voiced by the National Advisory Committee on the Education of Bilingual Children.

In May of 1974 Hearings were held in Washington, D.C. and in New York City before the General Subcommittee on Education of the Committee On Education and Labor. Hearings were held on H.R. 1085, H.R. 2490, and H.R. 11464 which were bills proposed to amend ESEA Title VII. The testimony at the Hearings revealed the importance of parent/community involvement in bilingual programs. Recommendations for revision of regulations by the National Advisory Committee on the

¹⁸United States Office of Education. Manual for Project Applicants and Grantees (Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1971), p. 67.

¹⁹Ibid.

Education of Bilingual Children reflected the views of witnesses giving testimony, as well as the views of Committee members. The recommendation on advisory groups reads as follows:

. . . referring to advisory groups the word may be changed to shall and that the words and others be added after secondary school students.²⁰

A more complete review of this regulation with reference to composition of advisory groups appears in Chapter 2.

The recommendation that parent/community involvement be "required" was incorporated into the "Criteria for Governing Grants Awards" which appeared in the Federal Register, June 11, 1976. More important than the rules and regulations requiring parent/community participation, the language in the Bilingual Education Act of 1974 now required participation by parents of children enrolled in bilingual programs. Specifically, the law read as follows:

An application for a program of bilingual education shall be developed in consultation with parents of children of limited English-speaking ability, teachers, and, where applicable, secondary school students, in the areas to be served, and assurances shall be given in the application that, after the application has been approved under this title, the applicant will provide for participation by a committee composed of, and selected by, such parents, and, in the case of secondary schools, representatives of secondary school students to be served.²¹

Even with the legislation mandating participation by a "committee" (known as an "advisory group" in the rules and regulations)

²⁰U.S., Congress, House, 93rd Cong., 2nd Sess., Hearings Before the General Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974), p. 108.

²¹United States Code Congressional and Administrative News: 90th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1974, I (St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Company, 1975).

the quantity and quality of participation has been a concern to school officials and citizens. The functions of parents advisory councils vary from project to project a fact revealed in a report entitled Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change. The report stated: ". . . some councils' functions are purely ceremonial whereas others seem to actually contribute to policy."²²

Citizens and educators realized that parent and community involvement has not always been present in bilingual education, and, when involvement was present, it was sometimes token in nature. In public hearings, in testimony given before the National Council on Bilingual Education in 1977, it was suggested that:

Funds should be directly earmarked for parent/community involvement in Title VII programs. Although parent/community involvement is encouraged under Title VII, many witnesses felt that it should be more stringently required.²³

It should be noted that the suggestions made concerning parent/community involvement in Title VII were not mentioned in the recommendations to the President and Congress in the "Second Annual Report" of 1976 by the National Advisory Council on Bilingual Education. Recommendations in the "Third Annual Report" of 1977 did, however, include the subject of parent/community involvement in bilingual programs.

²²Gerald C. Sumner and others, Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol III: The Process of Change (Santa Monica, Ca.: The Rand Corporation, 1975), p. III-4.

²³National Advisory Council on Bilingual Education Second Annual Report (Washington, D.C.: InterAmerica Research Associates, 1976), p. 8.

From the research conducted, the National Advisory Council concluded that: "Parent/community involvement has been a low priority issue in the operation of bilingual programs at the local level."²⁴ The national Council goes on to state:

With the progressive development of bilingual programs, the importance of parent/community input in such programs has increased. Yet no comprehensive attempt has been made to develop sufficient opportunities for concerned parents to become involved. Time has come for the design, development and implementation of strong parent/community involvement of programs.²⁵

The parent advisory council as a vehicle for a "strong parent/community involvement," needs its purpose clearly stated. Carpenter states that: "they (councils) need to know from the beginning just what they are supposed to do, as well as the limits of their participation."²⁶ Davies concurs with the beliefs of Carpenter and goes one step further by categorizing the activities of councils as follows:

1. resolving immediate problems or needs;
2. involving parents more directly in their children's education;
3. using community resources to enrich learning opportunities; and
4. participating in planning policy development, and decision making.²⁷

From a review of literature dealing with legislation and administrative policies on parent advisory councils in bilingual

²⁴National Advisory Council on Bilingual Education Third Annual Report (Washington, D.C.: InterAmerica Research Associates, 1977), p. 122.

²⁵Ibid.

²⁶C.C. Carpenter, "Principal Leadership and Parent Advisory Groups," Phi Delta Kappan, February, 1975, p. 26.

²⁷Don Davies, "Making Citizen Participation Work," National Elementary School Principal, March/April, 1976, p. 22.

education programs, it is evident that a true lack of direction for the advisory council exists. Functions mentioned in the 1971 Manual for Applicants and Grantees were guidelines recommended and not mandated. In 1976, the Federal Register included "Criteria for Governing Grants Awards" for bilingual programs. Once again, there was a lack of precise direction with respect to the functions of the parent advisory council.²⁸

It is assumed that if parent advisory councils in bilingual education are to function properly and contribute to the program, roles and functions of the councils should be clearly defined in order for all parties to adequately fulfill their respective responsibilities. It became crucial then, to identify and examine the role and functions of parent advisory councils in bilingual education programs. In order to do this, it seemed appropriate to investigate perceptions of project directors, school principals and the parent advisory council chairpersons working with bilingual education projects regarding the operation of parent advisory councils.

It was the intent of this study to answer the following questions:

1. What were the roles and functions of the parent advisory council serving a bilingual education project as recommended by the literature?

²⁸United States Office of Education, "Criteria for Governing Grants Awards," Federal Register, Friday, (June 11, 1976), p. 23866. (The Federal Register is a daily bulletin containing the roles and regulations of federal programs.)

2. What were the roles and functions of the parent advisory council serving a bilingual education project as perceived by the parent advisory council chairperson?

3. What were the roles and functions of the parent advisory council serving a bilingual education project as perceived by the school principal?

4. What were the roles and functions of the parent advisory council serving a bilingual education project as perceived by the project director?

5. What differences existed, if any, between the perceived roles and functions of the parent advisory council as viewed by chairpersons, school principals and project directors, with respect to: position of respondents, the language of the council, ethnicity, levels of education, sex, and age levels?

NEED OF THE STUDY

In reviewing the literature, the researcher found no studies dealing specifically with the questions asked and the hypotheses proposed concerning parent advisory councils serving bilingual education projects. The ERIC entries dated from 1861 to August 1977 showed no dissertations on bilingual education addressing the topic of parent advisory councils.²⁹ Concerning the proposed study there

²⁹William Higgins, compiler, "Dissertation-Bilingual Education," An Unscreened Computer Compilation (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1977).

were also no studies, abstracts, conferences or institutional resource centers to be found in a larger compilation under the general title of "Community Education."³⁰

Data and material relating to parent advisory councils is generally found in the form of models and designs for implementing citizen participation. Advocates such as Davies,³¹ Clasby,³² and Fantini,³³ have concluded that citizen participation is not new, but the resurgence of a concept which has been around for more than a decade. It would appear that studies need to be done which address issues of committee role and function, range of authority, and accountability of the advisory council to the community they represent and the groups they "advise."

There have been numerous studies on advisory councils (discussed in Chapter 2) but none which have examined such committees related to bilingual education and the special problems which may be inherent when two languages are used as mediums of communication: some of the council members speaking only their native tongue and the councils mandated as a precondition to project funding.

³⁰William Higgins, compiler, "Community Education," An Unscreened Computer Compilation (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1977).

³¹Davies, loc cit.

³²Clasby, loc. cit.

³³Mario Fantini, "Community, Participation: Many Faces, Many Directions," Educational Leadership, XXIX (1972).

The need for this study appeared evident when consideration was given to the following facts. In 1977 there were 287,000 linguistic minority students in America, of which 76% were Hispanic. The Office of Bilingual Education was funding 700 bilingual programs in 41 states and five territories at a cost of \$135 million.³⁴ Bilingual education was growing in the United States; there appeared to be desperate need for good administration of bilingual programs. Part of the administration of these programs required the establishment and utilization of community participation through mandated advisory councils.

At the time, there was no empirical data on parent advisory councils in bilingual education. There existed a lack of direction with respect to roles and functions of advisory councils, from both the federal government's legislation and administrative policies and from the efforts of the National Advisory Councils on Bilingual Education in making recommendations on parent/community involvement prior to 1977.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to identify and examine the roles and functions of Spanish-speaking parent advisory councils serving bilingual education projects funded under ESEA Title VII. The Spanish-speaking group is the largest linguistic minority served by the legislation. It was also the intention of the researcher to

³⁴"The Three R's in 70 Tongues," Time, February 13, 1978, p. 65.

determine if there existed significant differences between the three groups surveyed concerning their perceptions of the roles and functions of parent advisory councils. The perceptions of these three groups were utilized in examining the roles and functions of these advisory councils.

HYPOTHESES

The following null hypotheses were developed and included variables discussed in Limitations of the Study.

- H₀1 There is no difference in the perception between the groups of principals, project directors and advisory council chairpersons in regard to their perception of roles and functions of the Parent Advisory Council.
- H₀2 There is no difference in the perception between the group of principals, project directors and advisory council chairpersons who are Spanish-English bilinguals from those principals, project directors and advisory council chairpersons who are not Spanish-English bilinguals in regard to their perception of roles and functions of the Parent Advisory Council.
- H₀3 There is no difference in the perception between the groups of principals, project directors and chairpersons of different age levels in regard to their perception of roles and functions of the Parent Advisory Council.
- H₀4 There is no difference in the perception between the group of principals, project directors and advisory council chairpersons who are of the same ethnicity as the advisory council from those principals, project directors and advisory council chairpersons who are not of the same ethnicity as the advisory council in regard to their perception of roles and functions of the Parent Advisory Council.

H₀⁵ There is no difference in the perception between the groups of principals, project directors and advisory council chairpersons possessing different levels of education in regard to their perception of roles and functions of the Parent Advisory Council.

H₀⁶ There is no difference in the perception between the group of female principals, female project directors and female advisory council chairpersons from male principals, male project directors and male advisory council chairpersons in regard to their perception of roles and functions of the Parent Advisory Council.

DEFINITIONS

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions were developed within the context of bilingual education programs serving grades K-8 funded under ESEA Title VII.

Parent Advisory Council (PAC) - Term given to ". . . a committee composed of, and selected by such parents, and, in the case of secondary schools, representatives of secondary school students to be served.³⁵

School Principal - Building principal in a school with a bilingual program.

Project Director - School official appointed or elected to coordinate the bilingual education project.

Parent Advisory Council Chairperson - The elected or appointed head officer of the parent advisory council.

Perception - The communicated understanding that chairpersons, principals and project directors have of the roles and functions performed by a parent advisory council.

³⁵United States Code Congressional and Administrative News, loc. cit.

Ethnicity - The background or heritage which is identified by characteristics such as race, physical appearance, national origin or language.

Citizen Participation - A process whereby parents and community have the opportunity at local, state and federal levels, to voice their concerns, needs and aspirations and to influence the policies which directly or indirectly affect citizens.

Role - The term used to characterize the purpose of the parent advisory council with respect to the duties performed.

Function - A task or a series of tasks performed by the parent advisory council.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study was limited as follows:

1. The study was limited to those school districts with grades K-8, accepted and funded since 1976 by the United States Office of Education as Bilingual Education Projects.
2. The study was limited to those Bilingual Education Projects where Spanish and English are used as mediums of instruction.
3. The study was limited to the perceptions of principals, project directors and advisory council chairpersons regarding the roles and functions of Parent Advisory Councils in Bilingual Education Projects.

The school districts in the study were selected from the Guide To Title VII ESEA Bilingual-Bicultural Programs 1976-1977, Districts

receiving Title VII funds for Spanish-English bilingual projects since the 1976-1977 academic school year were chosen in order to have a large enough population whereby a sample could be chosen. Spanish-English bilingual projects with grades K-8 were chosen because they account for seventy-seven percent of the approximate 190,000 total of Spanish-speaking children enrolled in bilingual education programs.³⁶ The following three groups of participants were chosen:

1. Parent Advisory Council Chairpersons in Spanish-English Bilingual Education Projects with grades K-8.
2. School Principals in Spanish-English Bilingual Education Projects with grades K-8.
3. Project Directors in Spanish-English Bilingual Education Projects with grades K-8.

The three groups were identified as participants in the study because of the assumption that they would have the closest working relationship with the parent advisory council. The close working relationship would thus enable the advisory council chairpersons, the school principals and the project directors to complete a questionnaire developed to reflect their perceptions on the roles and functions of the parent advisory council.

There existed the possibility that extraneous variables could alter the perceptions of certain individuals within the three groups serving on the council. A factor which might prejudice the perception

³⁶ Education Service Center, Region XIII, Guide to Title VII ESEA Bilingual-Bicultural Programs 1976-1977, (Austin, Texas: Dissemination and Assessment Center for Bilingual Education, 1977).

was the position of each participant as principal, project director or chairperson. Language was viewed as a potentially important variable because some building principals, project directors and even advisory council chairpersons might not have been bilingual. Ethnicity also could have influenced the perceptions of certain individuals. The educational level, age level, and sex were three other variables examined with respect to the perceptions of the participants.

SUMMARY

The role of the federal government has been of major importance to the growth of the United States. The Congress, over a period of 200 years, has taken steps to insure the establishment of educational systems. The federal government's efforts in education for the individual as well as in human and civil rights has evolved.

When Congress took the leadership role in public education by legislating programs to equalize educational opportunities for minorities and, more specifically, for linguistic minorities, the federal government did not clearly define the procedures by which "maximum feasible participation" might be achieved with respect to educational programs. Congress legislated "committees" to participate in programs in the Bilingual Education Act of 1974.

Administrative policies of 1976 in the Federal Register reflected the language of the Bilingual Education Act but this publication, as well as the 1974 Act, made no mention of the roles and functions of advisory councils. Not only has there been a lack of direction from the federal government, but the National Council on

Bilingual Education also has failed to provide the direction and financial assistance to advisory councils until its Third Annual Report in 1977.

If roles and functions of advisory councils are to be defined and developed, it appeared vital that the perceptions of advisory council chairpersons, school principals and project directors toward these roles and functions be identified and examined. The future success of bilingual education in the United States depends, in part, on the meaningful participation of linguistic minorities in school affairs. Mechanics for participation of linguistic minorities must be developed within the context of the legal mandates of Congress. The perceptions of the three groups identified for this study seemed to be a logical base from which to solicit data related to roles and functions of parent advisory councils in bilingual education.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF MINORITY PARTICIPATION, FEDERAL LEGISLATION, AND PARENT ADVISORY COUNCILS

The purpose of this chapter was to present information on community participation and, more specifically, minority participation in education. Critical federal legislation giving citizens their right to participate in the democratic process was reviewed. Federal government's mandates of national and local advisory councils and administrative policies concerned with educational programs were investigated with respect to linguistic minorities in participatory school affairs, which was of critical significance to this study. Various roles and functions and organizational aspects were described according to models and studies on advisory councils. It is from the literature review that the roles and functions used in this study were derived.

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

Community participation is not a new movement in the American school system. The history of parental involvement in public schools is long and has usually taken the form of parent-teacher organization, band boosters, quarterback clubs and fund raising clubs.

Most of these groups appear to have at least two things in common: (1) they are not involved with the decision-making aspects of operating the school; and (2) they are primarily composed of and operated by middle-class parents.¹

¹Gordon Greenwood, William F. Braivogel and Robert E. Jester, "Citizen Advisory Committees," Theory Into Practice, XVI, No. 1 (February, 1977), 12-16.

In the 1950's Americans saw an increase in citizen involvement. There were several reasons for this increase: many schools were confronted with a shortage of funds to meet educational needs of children and the movement of securing equal educational opportunities for minorities. Another reason was the new ideas taught in courses which emphasized human relations when dealing with the public.² The human relations approach was aimed at the very nature of man because it was assumed that if a person took part in a decision affecting his life, he would tend to support the decision.³

The human relations approach was not the panacea its promoters envisioned. Citizens were solicited for cooperation and support in school programs; however, users of human relations techniques tended to emphasize public relations rather than human relations and omitted the true element of community participation in the decision-making process. The human relations approach to community participation caused conflicts in many school systems. The federal government, however, intervened by passing legislation which mandated community participation in the planning and control of federal programs.⁴

It is important to note that federal legislation mandating participation was originally aimed at the economic problems of minorities, at urban centers and at those considered to be in a state of poverty. The initial interest in citizen participation relating to

²Shelly Weinstein and Douglas E. Mitchell, eds., Public Testimony on Public Schools by National Committee for Citizens in Education, (Berkeley: McCutchen Publishing Corporation, 1975), p. 185.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

programs dealing with economic issues, led to an interest in citizen participation relating to educational concerns.⁵

PARTICIPATION BY MINORITIES

This study will now examine participation by minority groups first in American society in general and second in the educational system. For the purposes of the following section, minority groups will occasionally be replaced by the term "non-Anglo" which generally characterizes minority groups in the United States.

American society has seen different methods of assimilation by non-Anglo cultures. There are three categories of assimilation: the Anglo conformity, the melting pot and cultural pluralism. Non-Anglos have tried to enter the American mainstream by either conforming to Anglo values or attempting to "melt" into the Anglo society by working, socializing and intermarrying. Some ethnic cultures failed at both conforming and melting into American society and thus turned to their respective cultures, traditions and languages for survival in a society where being different has, in some cases, meant being less than inferior.⁶

Burger points out that:

The Anglo conformity theory demanded the complete renunciation of the immigrant's ancestral culture in favor of the behavior and values of the Anglo-Saxon core group. By contrast, the melting pot idea proposed a biological merger of Anglo-Saxon people with other immigrant groups. Along with the intermarriage there would be a blending of cultures in a new single, native

⁵Ibid.

⁶Cole S. Brembeck and Walker H. Hill, Cultural Challenge To Education (Lexington: D.C. Heath and Company, 1973), p. 5.

"American type." Cultural pluralism favored the preservation of the communal life and significant portions of the culture of later immigrant groups within the context of American citizenship.⁷

Of the three methods of assimilation into American society by non-Anglo cultures, cultural pluralism was advocated as early as the late 1800's but was never popular due to the "wave of nationalism, anti-Catholicism and xenophobia that swept the United States."⁸

Assimilation is a phenomenon whereby society generates cultural demands on certain groups. Cultural demands of the majority society were not fulfilled by all majority groups, and thus ethnicity acquired increased importance. Cultural pluralism was inevitable because according to Glazer and Moynihan the "melting pot" never melted.⁹

The American Indians have never melted even though the Bureau of Indian Affairs once insisted on complete assimilation.¹⁰ The American Indians and Spanish-speakers have tried to maintain their heritages by demanding instruction in their native languages. Public awareness of social problems; as well as political activities by non-Anglos, have set the foundation for bilingual education. John and Horner state:

Much of the present attention directed toward bilingual education in this country has been sparked by the vocal demands

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Barbara Stencel, Bilingual Education, Vol. II, No. 7, Editorial Research Reports (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly, 1977), p.627.

⁹ Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan, Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish of New York City (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1970).

¹⁰ William A. Brophy and others, The Indian (Norman, Oklahoma: The University of Oklahoma Press, 1972), p. 10.

of Spanish-speaking and Indian language groups. The political impact of these groups is increasingly felt in the national scene, as they continue to struggle for the maintenance of their linguistic and cultural identities.¹¹

LEGISLATION ASSISTING MINORITIES

American citizenship has been a necessity to engage in the democratic process, which usually implies the right to vote for representation in government. Minority groups in the past who have not had the right to vote are Blacks, Spanish-speaking, American Indians, and Orientals. Women also were once denied the right to vote. A brief overview follows of the sections and amendments to the U.S. Constitution concerned with citizenship, voting rights and civil rights.

According to the Constitution of the United States Article I, Section 2, before amended:

Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective Numbers, which shall be determined by adding to whole Number of free Persons, including those bound to Service for a Term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three fifths of all other Persons.¹²

This Article, thus, did not afford to all people the right to participate in the political process by voting.

The Emancipation Proclamation of January 1, 1863 freed only the slaves in the States where rebellion was taking place against the United States. According to this Proclamation slaves in the

¹¹Vera P. John and Vivian M. Horner, Early Childhood Bilingual Education (New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1971), p. xxii.

¹²Lester S. Jayson, ed., The Constitution of the United States of America (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973), pp. 3-4.

slave-holding states which had not seceded were not freed. The Thirteenth Amendment eliminated slavery. It states:

Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.¹³

This Amendment was not sufficient because it did not clarify the citizenship status of all the people in the United States, even though all people were now free.

On July 20, 1868, Congress passed Amendment Fourteen of the U.S. Constitution which clearly gave all persons, born or naturalized in the United States and of the State where they lived, the rights as citizens of the United States, to life, liberty, property, due process and equal protection under the law.¹⁴ Amendment XV, which was passed on February 27, 1869, gave all citizens, as defined in Amendment XIV, the right to vote regardless of ". . . race, color, or previous condition of servitude."¹⁵ It is important to note that the passage of Amendment XV did not give women the right to vote. Women received the right to vote with the passage of Amendment XIX.¹⁶

With the passage of Amendments XIV, XV, and XIX, the Congress recognized the right of all American citizens to life, liberty, property, due process, equal protection under the law and the right to engage

¹³Ibid., p. 1289.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 31.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 33.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 1571.

in the democratic process by voting in elections. The Forty-First Congress passed the Civil Rights Act of February 28, 1871. This Act was an "act to enforce the rights of citizens of the United States to vote in the several States of this Union, and for other purposes."¹⁷ On April 20, 1871, Congress passed the second Civil Rights Act which was to enforce the provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment. The language in the Act states: "An act to protect all persons in the United States in their civil rights, and to furnish the means of their vindication."¹⁸

In 1964, citizens in the United States were given additional assurances of their rights. On January 23, 1964, the Twenty-Fourth Amendment became part of the Constitution after being ratified by thirty-eight states. The Twenty-Fourth Amendment barred the use of a poll tax for voting in the 1969 Presidential and Congressional elections and all subsequent elections.¹⁹

Disliking the probability that all citizens would be voting in both federal and state elections, four states: Alabama, Mississippi, Texas and Virginia set up a dual election system. The system allowed all citizens to vote in federal elections without payment of the poll

¹⁷George P. Sanger, ed., Statutes at Large and Proclamations of the United States of America, XVI (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1873), 433.

¹⁸George P. Sanger, ed., Statutes at Large and Proclamations of the United States of America, XVII (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1873), 13.

¹⁹Henrietta Poynter and Nelson Poynter, Congressional Quarterly Almanac, 88th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1964, XX (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Service, 1965), 381.

tax but, only with payment of the poll tax, were citizens allowed to vote for state and local officials as well as state and local referendums.²⁰

This situation caused much controversy and civil rights advocates were demanding full rights to voting in all elections, without poll taxes or any other restriction. In 1965, Congress, recognizing the rights of all citizens to vote in all elections, enacted the Voting Rights Act of 1965 which states:

No voting qualifications or prerequisites to voting or standard or procedure shall be imposed or applied by any State or political subdivision to deny or abridge the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race or color.²¹

In the same year that the Anti-Poll Amendment was ratified, Congress passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Prior to this Act, voting rights had been denied by certain states to Blacks, Spanish-speaking, American Indians and Orientals because of technicalities in State laws requiring special application or registration procedures, as well as a literacy test. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 was an important impetus in promoting citizen participation, especially among groups such as Blacks, Spanish-speaking, American Indians and Orientals who, even as American citizens, had not previously had a

²⁰Ibid., p. 382.

²¹Chester J. Antieau, Federal Civil Rights, Civil Practice (Rochester, N.Y.: The Lawyer's Cooperative Publishing Company, 1971), p. 13.

real opportunity to be a part of the democratic process. The Act was passed by Congress and stated:

To enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Opportunity, and for other purposes.²²

Even though the Civil Rights Act of 1964 did not allow discrimination in federally assisted programs, improprieties did continue in education. Weinberg feels that minorities have never truly had complete educational opportunities. He further feels that "racial and ethnic barriers were accepted by school people as inevitable limitations on educational opportunity."²³ Minority groups have had difficulty entering the democratic process in general but, in the educational process specifically, supporting Weinberg Lapote states:

Minority children and their parents have been progressively isolated from decision making levels in schools through consolidation and centralization. These children and their parents have had little identification and only modest involvement in the educational process; they have not participated, nor even been represented in education or in the social-political life of their nation.²⁴

²²Civil Rights Act of 1964, Publ. L. 88-352, 88th Cong., 1st Sess., H.R. 715, (1964).

²³Meyer Weinberg, ed., A Chance to Learn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), p. 2.

²⁴Carole Lapote, Some Effects of Parent and Community Participation on Public Education (New York: Columbia University, 1969), p. 36.

Educators can benefit from the involvement of citizens by becoming more familiar with the attitudes and the aspirations that the community has for its children. In respect to bilingual education, Ulibarri feels that the program must be completely in tune with the community it serves. He points out that:

A program that does not take into account the problems of the community, the needs of the individuals, and the aspirations of the people cannot hope to be anything more than a veneer that helps to hide the anomalies of the community and to engender helplessness in the individual. Such a program will never have the support of the community not the enthusiasm of the individual.²⁵

Community involvement in bilingual education has been of major concern to both school systems and communities. John and Horner agree with Ulibarri by emphasizing the importance of community involvement when they state:

The participation of parents is a critical aspect of bilingual education. Although many bilingual educators support this view, they fail to implement it. When programs are planned in isolation from the community, parents' contributions become merely incidental. Parental participation and community control do not guarantee relief from the shortage of qualified teachers, the lack of curriculum materials, limited funds, or from any other of the problems of bilingual education. Such participation and control do, however, provide support for the continuity to the schools' efforts.²⁶

The Congress, recognizing the importance of community participation and realizing the lack of this vital input throughout the nation, found it necessary to legislate in order to insure community

²⁵Horacio Ulibarri, Bilingual Education: A Handbook for Educators (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1970), p. 1.

²⁶John and Horner, op. cit., p. 187.

involvement in programs receiving federal funds. The two laws which had the most impact were the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965. An overview of these two Acts follows.

THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964

Legislation passed during the years of 1964-1968 had great impact on American society. President Johnson waged his "war on poverty" which was his cornerstone to the Great Society. The anti-poverty legislation was the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.²⁷ The philosophy of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 was not that existing wealth should be distributed to those afflicted by poverty, but that the poor could and should be given opportunities to maintain a comfortable living standard by earning a decent living wage. The Act also assumed that opportunities given to the poor would come from "a commitment on the part of the people, the communities, private organizations and all level of government."²⁸

The key sections of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 provided for Job Corps, Community Action Programs, Special Program to Combat Poverty in Rural Areas, Employment and Investment Incentives and Work Experience Programs. The word "participation" can be found throughout the EOA of 1964, but nowhere is this work used with

²⁷William B. Dickenson, Jr., ed., "Health, Education and Welfare," Congress and the Nation, II, 1965-68, (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Service, 1969), 663.

²⁸United States Code Congressional and Administrative News: 88th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1964, II, (St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Company, 1965), 2901.

more emphasis than in the section defining the Community Action Program: "The term Community Action Program means a program . . . which is developed, conducted and administered with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served."²⁹

Daniel P. Moynihan who assisted in drafting the original poverty legislation proposed in his book Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding that the phrase "maximum feasible participation" was misunderstood by many people concerned with Community Action Programs. Consequently, there existed mismanagement of these programs. Moynihan feels that community participation is needed and long overdue; however, administrators of community programs must enlist good judgement instead of emotions dominated by the heart.³⁰

THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 which is the greatest categorical aid program in education ever enacted. Support in Congress which favored federal aid to education had developed because of financial difficulties on both local and state levels.³¹

²⁹United States Code Congressional and Administrative News: 88th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1964, I, (St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Company, 1965), 595.

³⁰Daniel P. Moynihan, Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding (New York: The Free Press, 1969).

³¹Dickenson, op. cit., p. 70.

The key sections of the ESEA of 1965 were programs which provided financial aid to Educationally Deprived Children, Libraries, Supplementary Education, Cooperative Research, State Education Development, and Handicapped Children. Ninety-five percent of the nation's counties were eligible for all or some of the programs mentioned. The majority of the money was intended to aid children of the inner city and poor rural areas.³²

The federal role in public education has traditionally been supplementary in nature except for matters involving civil rights and religious freedom. The passage of the ESEA of 1965 strengthened the role played by the federal government in public education.³³ The importance of the federal government's role in public education is stated by the American Association of School Administrators as follows:

The federal government brings to the educational partnership a national point of view, the ability to focus attention of the nation upon the problems of education, a more efficient way to finance research and development work of common value to all states, a revenue potential unhampered by overdependence upon property taxation or by interstate economic competition.

Finally, and most important, only the federal government can compensate for deficiencies in the school tax potential of low-income states and provide resources needed to improve school standards in these states.³⁴

President Johnson believed that the federal government was capable of assuming the leadership role described by the AASA. On

³²Ibid., p. 663.

³³AASA, The Federal Government and Public Schools, (Washington: American Association of School Administrators, 1965), p. 60.

³⁴Ibid.

January 12, 1965, the President's educational message to Congress expressed a similar point of view. He stated that four major tasks confront us:

- to bring better education to millions of disadvantaged youth who need it most;
- to put the best education equipment and ideas and innovations within reach of all the students;
- to advance the technology of teaching and training of teachers;
- to provide incentives for those who wish to learn at every stage along the road to learning.³⁵

The passage of the ESEA of 1965 enabled school districts across the nation to confront the tasks presented by President Johnson. Local and state authorities which took advantage of federal programs under ESEA of 1965 were providing the federal government a leadership role often needed in local and state activities concerned with education.

THE PASSAGE OF ESEA TITLE VII

Multilingualism in the United States is not new. In Colonial America, French was used in what is today Maine and Louisiana. Spanish was spoken throughout the Southwest of the United States and the area which is today Florida. There were also many dialects spoken by the different American Indians throughout the entire United States.

There was never federal aid to assist linguistic minorities until 1968 when Congress passed Title VII Bilingual Education Programs

³⁵Henrietta Poynter and Nelson Poynter, "Major Legislations -- Appropriations," Congressional Quarterly Almanac, XXI, 1965, (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Service, 1966), 270.

to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. There were several factors which influenced Congress to pass Title VII which authorized federal monies to assist linguistic minorities in their quest for equal education opportunities.

One of the first factors to influence Congress in the passage of Title VII was the wave of Cuban immigrants who had moved primarily into Florida after the Castro revolution in Cuba. Secondly, professionals in education realized that Puerto Ricans and Mexican Americans in the United States needed special help. The Civil Rights movement of the 1960's and, specifically, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 brought to the forefront the right of all citizens to have equal educational opportunities. Another factor was that the federal government was taking the leadership role and wanted to aid children with mother tongues other than English.³⁶

Research by Lambert and Peal from McGill University revealed that a child learns best in his mother tongue. Gaarder prepared a statement for the special Subcommittee on Bilingual Education on May 18, 1967. He outlined five main reasons which supported bilingual education; which Andersson and Boyer feel is a complete rationale supporting bilingual education.

(1) Children who enter school with less competence in English than monolingual English-speaking children will probably become retarded in their school work to the extent of their deficiency in English, if English is the sole medium of instruction. On the other hand, the bilingual child's conceptual development and acquisition of other experience and information could proceed at a normal rate if the mother tongue were used as an alternative medium of instruction. . .

³⁶ Albar A. Pena, "Special Feature on Bilingual Education: An Overview," Today's Education, January-February, 1975, p. 71.

(2) Non-English speaking children come from non-English-speaking homes. The use of the child's mother tongue by some of the teachers and as a school language is necessary if there is to be a strong, mutually reinforcing relationship between the home and the school.

(3) Language is the most important exteriorization or manifestation of the self, of the human personality. If the school, the all powerful school, rejects the mother tongue of an entire group of children, it can be expected to affect seriously and adversely those children's concept of their parents, their homes, and themselves.

(4) If he has not achieved reasonable literacy in his mother tongue--ability to read, write, and speak it accurately--it will be virtually useless to him for any technical or professional work where language matters. Thus, his unique potential career advantage, his bilingualism, will have been destroyed.

(5) Our people's native competence in Spanish and French and Czech and all the other languages and the cultural heritage each language transmits are a national resource that we must conserve by every reasonable means.³⁷

Factors such as experts in bilingual education, the civil rights movement and Cuban refugees were not the only forces influencing Congress. In the political arena, Schneider's study concluded that individual Senators and Congressmen with a constituency with a large number of non- or limited English-speaking people supported bilingual-bicultural education. Senator Edward Kennedy, Democrat of Massachusetts, and Senator Alan Cranston, Democrat of California, were highly in favor of this bill because of the large numbers of limited English-speaking persons in their states. Former Senator Peter Dominick, Republican of Colorado, had a conservative philosophy, doubted the value of bilingual-bicultural education, but supported the bill, in part, because of "his perceptions of his constituents' support for

³⁷Theodore Andersson and Mildred Boyer, Bilingual Schooling in the United States, "Statement by A. Bruce Gaarder," I, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970), 50-51.

Federally-supported bilingual-bicultural education program."³⁸

Schneider also found that Congressional courtesy and relationships among Senators and Congressmen facilitated "the resolution of differences through compromise."³⁹ Schneider goes on to state:

. . . that the thrust of Federal support to bilingual-bicultural education related directly to a general acceptance by Congress of the goal of equal educational opportunities. In this regard, the role of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights in highlighting past inequalities of opportunity experienced by limited English-speaking groups was crucial.⁴⁰

Following is a brief summary of the passage of ESEA Title VII after introduction of the bill by Senator Ralph Yarborough, Democrat of Texas. Senator Yarborough introduced S.428 to the Senate on January 17, 1967. In his introduction to S.428, he stated:

This is not a general aid bill to all schools with Mexican American students. Rather it is a bill which will enable many schools to make large expenditures required to substantially revamp their courses. These schools will be able to experiment, try new things, blaze new trails, and demonstrate to other schools what might be done. Compared to the minor shot in the arm which most schools are receiving from Title I of the Elementary-Secondary Education Act, the Bilingual American Education Act will be a major transfusion of new blood. Schools which are selected for the program will receive the resources they need to do a real job. And I hope that the example they set will influence other schools to follow their lead.⁴¹

The Special Subcommittee on Bilingual Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reviewed Senator

³⁸Susan G. Schneider, "The 1974 Bilingual Education Amendments: Revolution, Reaction Or Reform," (PhD Dissertation, The University of Maryland, 1976) pp. 355-356.

³⁹Ibid., p. 357.

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 361.

⁴¹U.S. Congress, Senate, A Bill to Amend the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965, Pub. L. 89-10, 90th Cong., 1st Sess., 17 January 1967, S.428, Congressional Record 113: S599.

Yarborough's bill and concluded that a problem did, in fact, exist and that "the purpose of this new title is to provide a solution to the problems of those children who are educationally disadvantaged because of their inability to speak English."⁴²

Schneider's in depth review of the legislative process prior to the passage of ESEA Title VII, revealed that thirty-seven bills were introduced in the House of Representatives that resembled the bill introduced in the Senate by Senator Yarborough. Even though these bills had been introduced to the House, the House Committee on Labor and Education originally passed H.R. 7819, which did not include provisions for bilingual-bicultural education.

Schneider goes on to state that:

Only after it became evident that Senate Action would include such provisions did new hearings in the House begin on the issue of whether the Federal Government should be a principal supporter and financier of these programs.⁴³

Representative James Scheuer, Democrat of New York, introduced a bilingual-bicultural bill, H.R. 9840 to the House of Representatives. H.R. 9840 became H.R. 13103 which was to be modified and passed as an amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. H.R. 7819 now included provisions for federal aid to bilingual-bicultural education.⁴⁴

The Senate Special Subcommittee on Bilingual Education reported on S.428 to the Full Committee. On November 2, 1967 the

⁴²U.S., Congress, Senate, Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1967, S. Rept. 726 to Accompany H.R. 7819, 90th Cong., 1st Sess., 1967, p. 50.

⁴³Schneider, op. cit., p. 54.

⁴⁴Andersson and Boyer, op. cit., p. v.

Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare adopted S.428 to amend H.R. 7819. The Senate bill which added Title VII to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 now provided federal grants to enable local educational agencies to develop bilingual programs.⁴⁵

Debate in the Senate and House centered on such topics as: the cost of bilingual-bicultural programs, the justification for federal support, whether legislation would assist only Spanish-speakers, and cultural autonomy by minority groups.⁴⁶ In December 1967, there was a closed Conference between the Senate and the House which resulted in the Conferees accepting the Senate provisions with two changes by the House. On December 15, 1967 H.R. 7819 passed the House and the Senate agreed to the Conference Report on H.R. 7819. On January 2, 1968, President Johnson signed H.R. 7819 with Title VII as Public Law 90-247.⁴⁷

PARTICIPATION AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The ESEA of 1965 continued the precedent set by the EOA of 1964 by placing a high priority on the participation of community members in federal programs. Participation was defined either in the legislation or in the administrative policies which were subsequently developed for the operation of programs.⁴⁸

⁴⁵ United States Code Congressional and Administrative News: 90th Cong., 1st Sess., 1967, II (St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Company, 1967) 2779-2780.

⁴⁶ Schneider, op. cit., p. 57.

⁴⁷ Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967, Statutes at Large 81, (1968), 783.

⁴⁸ Melvin B. Mogulof, Citizen Participation: A Review on Federal Policies and Practices (Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, 1970), p. 33.

The term "participation" can be interpreted differently even if the term is formalized in the legislation or program guidelines. In a study conducted by the Urban Institute, Mogulof defined participation in reference to federal programs:

Participation can be viewed as an act or a series of acts by which the citizen has the opportunity to influence the distribution of benefits or losses which may be visited upon him (or upon those people he represents) as a result of Federally supported activity.⁴⁹

Both the EOA of 1964 and the ESEA of 1965 provided for citizen participation, but, according to Mogulof, few federal officials are capable of defining the concept of participation. Mogulof further states:

We are impressed with the great confusion and ambiguity existing amongst Federal officials around the concept of participation. Few personnel seem aware of the range or options covered by the idea of participation. Few agencies have any working definition as to what participation ought to involve.⁵⁰

The study further indicated that almost all agencies preferred to leave the definition of participation to local communities but were prepared to serve as mediators when conflicts developed between the federal program and the citizens. Even though participation was not defined by most federal officials, the study was able to identify four purposes of citizen participation in federal programs. The purposes are:

1. to decrease alienation.
2. to engage the "sick" individual in a process which will lead to his own healing.

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 2.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 20.

3. to create a neighborhood power force able to influence the distribution of resources.
4. to develop a constituency for a particular program, with the hope that the constituency will agree to the intended program efforts.⁵¹

From the review of the study conducted by the Urban Institute, the researcher concludes that participation was not well defined by the federal government even though legislation mandated participation in various federal programs funded by OEO and USOE.

The literature revealed four roles assumed by advisory councils. Information found in the report entitled Federal Programs Supporting Education Change, suggested a non-supporter role characterized by reactions against the program and a lack of support for school officials in attaining goals.⁵²

Cronin and Thomas identified three other roles when they surveyed the members of twenty-six councils and committees which advised the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The study examined individual role definitions and the members' attitudes toward the advisory processes experienced in their councils. These roles were described by the council and committee members: advisor role, director role and supporter role.⁵³

⁵¹Ibid., p. 93.

⁵²Gerald C. Sumner and others, Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change Vol. III: The Process of Change (Santa Monica, Ca.: The Rand Corporation, 1975)

⁵³Thomas E. Cronin and Norman C. Thomas, "Federal Advisory Processes: Advice and Discontent," Science, CLXXI (February, 1971), 771.

The advisor role was defined as follows:

An advisory council is not for the purpose of administering an educational program. . . It should serve as a sounding board or guide to those selected to administer.⁵⁴

It was the feeling of the council members surveyed that the advisor role contained several different elements. An advisor could be the "man in the field, the critic, the monitor, the forecaster, and the wise counselor."⁵⁵

Some council members desired more involvement in federal programs and their policies. Thus evolved the director role which was defined by comments such as:

Members should be more involved in policy formation rather than reacting to policy already determined.

If councils are made up of truly able individuals, then they should be policy-making rather than advisory.⁵⁶

Finally, some council members saw their roles as supporters. They felt that the supporter role meant giving reassurance and interpreting the program to the public. Cronin and Thomas felt that the supporter role was often solicited by departmental or bureau officials who wanted support for their programs.⁵⁷

In addition to the role definitions, Cronin and Thomas also inquired about the functions of the council members by asking those surveyed to check the characteristics which best described their

⁵⁴Ibid.

⁵⁵Ibid.

⁵⁶Ibid.

⁵⁷Ibid., p. 773.

respective councils. Following is the list of functions which were ranked:

1. Advice on program priorities.
2. Review guidelines and regulations.
3. Make managerial suggestions.
4. Work out new legislation.
5. Work on publicity and support.
6. Do lobbying work.⁵⁸

Even though members of these councils and committees were able to characterize their respective units from advising to lobbying; there was a substantial number of participants who felt that they were not contributing to the policy-making activities of the federal government. It was concluded by Cronin and Thomas that a major problem was the ambiguity in the development of the councils as well as the specific functions which are expected of the councils.⁵⁹

Cronin and Thomas advocate the use of advisory councils in federal government. Congress should have more appreciation for the councils which they legislate, because ". . . advisory councils can help to redirect uncertain federal programs and to recast misdirected policy intentions."⁶⁰

This section has concentrated on the role and functions of national advisory councils as perceived by participants in the study by Cronin and Thomas. The next section will focus on the legislation of national and local advisory councils.

⁵⁸Ibid.

⁵⁹Ibid., p. 778.

⁶⁰Ibid., p. 779.

THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

When the ESEA of 1965 was passed by Congress, evaluation of each federal program was necessary. Bailey and Mosher point out:

To make sure that USOE reports would not simply be in-house and self-serving, Congress mandated a series of statutory advisory councils or committees whose responsibilities included the filing of periodic summaries and evaluations of program performance.⁶¹

Provisions for a National Advisory Council can be found in Section 212 of the ESEA of 1965. This Council is appointed with the clear purpose of reviewing the administration and operation of federal programs in this Act. The National Advisory Council is directly responsible to the President who appoints each member.

The Council shall make an annual report of its findings and recommendations. . . to the President not later than March 31 of each calendar year beginning after the enactment of this title. The President shall transmit each report to the Congress together with his comments and recommendations.⁶²

The recommendations of the National Advisory Council are vital because they formulate part of the basis for the continued appropriations by Congress for federal programs under the ESEA of 1965.

Under Title VI General Provisions (in 1968 this title was replaced by Title VI Handicapped Children), Section 602 explained the provisions for additional advisory councils.

The Commissioner may without regard to the civil service laws, and subject to the Secretary's approval in such cases as the Secretary may prescribe, from time to time appoint,

⁶¹Stephen K. Bailey and Edith K. Mosher, ESEA The Office of Education Administers A Law (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1968), p. 182.

⁶²Dickenson, op. cit., p. 712.

in addition to the advisory councils and committees authorized in preceding titles, an advisory council of ten members to advise and consult with respect to his functions under his law.⁶³

The significance of Section 602 is that "advisory councils" were believed to be vital; and that additional consultation could be sought from the Commissioner by advisory councils which he could create.

THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON BILINGUAL EDUCATION

When the Title VII Bilingual Education Programs was passed in 1968 as an amendment to the ESEA of 1965, Section 708 of this title legislated for an "Advisory Committee" which was to be established by the Commissioner and located in the Office of Education. The Advisory Committee was given an instrumental role in aiding the Commissioner.

The Advisory Committee shall advise the Commissioner in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of the title, including the development of criteria for approval of applications thereunder. The Commissioner may appoint such special advisory and technical experts and consultants as may be useful and necessary in carrying out the functions of the Advisory Committee.⁶⁴

There were conflicts about the purpose and functions of this advisory body. The problems were resolved between the DHEW General Council and the Senate and House Staff in a plan proposed to the Secretary of DHEW on September 24, 1974. Following are the specific points of the plan:

⁶³Ibid., p. 719.

⁶⁴United States Code Congressional and Administrative News: 90th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1967, I (St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Company, 1968), 920.

- a. extend the charter for the Advisory Committee on the Education of Bilingual Children (it expired on June 30, 1973);
- b. charter the National Advisory Council on Bilingual Education;
- c. fill current vacancies on the Committee;
- d. appoint the members of the Committee to the Council;
- e. through the Commissioner's Annual Report, terminate the Committee on March 31, 1975.⁶⁵

In 1974, six years after the initial passage of Title VII Bilingual Education Act of 1968, Title VII Bilingual Education Act of 1974 was enacted which was more comprehensive than the original Bilingual Act.

Section 732 in the Bilingual Education Act of 1974 now provided for a National Advisory Council on Bilingual Education. The provision was considerably more precise in the Bilingual Act of 1974 than in the Bilingual Act of 1968 which only provided for an "Advisory Committee." The National Council On Bilingual Education not only advised the Commissioner in the preparation of regulations, the administration and operation of Title VII, the development of criteria for approval of applications, but was also delegated to advise on ". . . the administration and operation of other programs for persons of limited English-speaking ability."⁶⁶

THE PARENT ADVISORY COUNCIL

In 1971, the U.S. Office of Education with the assistance of the Advisory Committee legislated in the Bilingual Education Act

⁶⁵ National Advisory Council on Bilingual Education, Annual Report National Advisory Council on Bilingual Education, (Washington, D.C.: J.A. Reyes Associates, Inc., 1975), p. 21.

⁶⁶ United States Code Congressional and Administrative News: 90th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1974, I (St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Company, 1975), 573.

of 1968, formulated the Manual for Project Applicants and Grantees which included guidelines for Parent Advisory Councils. The Title VII Manual, with guidelines for bilingual projects, mentions the necessity to involve the parents and the community in the program through advisory groups by stating:

A project advisory group which consists of parents and community representatives should be formed before the project proposal is prepared and should continue to be involved at all stages of the project's development and operation.⁶⁷

The Manual further states that without community support, goals cannot be properly achieved and plans will be incomplete. To avoid these dilemmas, the functions of the advisory group were outlined as follows:

1. To help develop and implement the project.
2. To represent the interests of the parents and community (including public agencies and community groups).
3. To assist in evaluating the project.
4. To establish a procedure by which grievances of parents can receive prompt consideration and to participate in resolving grievances.
5. To promote the project in the community.
6. To assist in mobilizing community resources in support of the project.⁶⁸

After the development of the Title VII Manual no mention of Parent Advisory Councils was made again in administrative policy or rules and regulations for applicants and grantees until 1976. The

⁶⁷ United States Office of Education, Manual for Project Applicants and Grantees (Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1971), p. 67.

⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 68.

National Advisory Council on Bilingual Education, legislated in the Bilingual Education Act of 1974, assisted as had the previous "Advisory Committee," in formulating the criteria for approval of applications submitted by local educational agencies.

The National Advisory Council suggested strongly that the citizens in the community receiving federal funds for bilingual education have the assurance of representation on local advisory councils. In order to qualify for federal funds for bilingual education projects, local and state education agencies must adhere to the regulations which govern the granting of Title VII funds. To insure parent and community involvement in bilingual education programs, the USOE which is an arm of the executive branch of government, wrote into administrative policy the following criteria for governing grants awards:

§123.17 Parent and Community Participation

(a) Information and assurances

(1) Applications for assistance under this subpart shall contain a description of the procedure by which parents of children of limited English-speaking ability, teachers, secondary school students (where the proposed program will serve students enrolled in secondary schools), and other interested persons in areas to be served have been consulted in the development of the application.

(i) The applicant will consult with a community advisory committee established in accordance with paragraph (b) of this at reasonable intervals (at formal meetings open to the public) with respect to the administration and operation of the program,

(ii) The applicant will provide such committee with a reasonable opportunity periodically to observe (upon prior and adequate notice by the applicant and at such time or times as such committee and such applicant may agree) and comment upon all activities included in the program; and

(iii) The applicant will make such provisions as are necessary to insure the participation of such committee in the evaluation of the program.

(b) Composition of community advisory committee

The community advisory committee required by this section shall be composed of, and selected by, parents of children of limited English-speaking ability in the areas to be served and, where the program will serve students enrolled in secondary schools, representatives of secondary school students to be served.⁶⁹

The requirements for local and state educational agencies applying for Title VII funds are very precise. Prior to the approval of the application, the educational agencies must demonstrate that parents of limited English-speaking ability have been consulted in regard to the proposed bilingual program. If the application is approved, the agencies must also insure the continuance of community involvement by having public meetings concerning "administration and operation of the program." The educational agencies, according to the administrative policy, must afford the advisory committees the opportunity to observe and comment on the program and to assist in the evaluation of the program.⁷⁰

The criteria for grants awards also mandate the composition of these committees. It is imperative to point out that the language in the section describing the composition of advisory committees, specifically states: "The community advisory committee . . . shall be composed of and selected by parents of children of limited English-speaking ability. . ."⁷¹ This language emphasizes the government's commitment in assuring citizen participation.

⁶⁹U.S. Office of Education, "Criteria for Governing Grants Awards," Federal Register, Friday, (June 11, 1976), p. 23866. (The Federal Register is a daily bulletin containing the rules and regulations of federal programs.)

⁷⁰Ibid.

⁷¹Ibid.

The federal government developed the legislation which mandated participation by communities in federal programs, and specifically stated that advisory councils were to be composed to facilitate participation. The following section discusses the organizational aspects of advisory councils.

ORGANIZATION OF ADVISORY COUNCILS

In the review of literature dealing with the organizational characteristics, roles and functions of advisory councils, the researcher found studies dating as far back as 1949 and as recent as 1976. Caldwell's review of the literature found "that a variety of purposes and functions characterize the lay advisory groups which are continually developing in the American system of public education."⁷² This researcher has also found a variety of functions which councils are performing, as well as a variety of organizational characteristics.

It is important that parent groups organize in such a manner that the operation is simple enough to be understood by all council members. Sumption and Engstrom feel that for good community-school relationships ". . . there must be a structured, systematic and active participation on the part of the people of the community in the educational planning, policy making, problem solving and evaluation of the school."⁷³ Davies concurs with this statement by saying: "An

⁷²T. P. Caldwell, "An Assessment of Arizona Community School Administrators Concerning School-Community Advisory Councils in Educational Decision-Making" (unpublished PhD dissertation, The University of Michigan, 1974), p. 67.

⁷³Merle R. Sumption and Yvonne Engstrom, School-Community Relations: A New Approach (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company), 1966, p. xi.

effective council needs rules for its operation."⁷⁴

Linscomb's study of advisory councils recommends that councils be organized on a formal basis.⁷⁵ Councils organized on a formal basis were found to be effective in their operation and consequently were more effective in performing their functions.

Davies has outlined the necessary elements which he feels should be included in the by-laws of a council which is formally organized:

- Article I: Name of Organization
- Article II: Purposes
- Article III: Functions and Limitations of Authority
 - A. Definitions
 - B. Categories and numbers of representatives
 - C. Methods and rules of selection; voting procedures
 - D. Terms of office
 - E. Voting rights of members
 - F. Termination of membership
 - G. Vacancies
- Article V: Officers and their duties
- Article VI: Executive Committee
- Article VII: Committees
- Article VIII: Meetings (frequency and location)⁷⁶

The first article requires the name of the organization.

It is necessary for the simple purpose of identifying the organization in question. The name should reflect, as much as possible, the major

⁷⁴Don Davies, Schools Where Parents Make A Difference (Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, 1976), p. 161.

⁷⁵J. P. Linscomb, "The Structure and Organization of Successful Community Advisory Councils in an Inner-City Area of Los Angeles City Unified School District" (unpublished PhD dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1972), p. 81.

⁷⁶Davies, loc. cit.

characteristics of the organization, i.e. parent advisory council if the council is composed of primarily parents or community advisory council if, in fact, the council is composed of citizens from throughout the community and its organizations. In bilingual education projects funded under Title VII of ESEA; the name should be "Parent Advisory Council" because the administrative policy clearly states: ". . . shall be composed of, and selected by parents. . ." ⁷⁷

The second article, "Purposes," suggested by Davies is important in defining why the council is organized. The purpose written in this article should be clear and precise, and should include language which promotes democratic participation between the school and community. ⁷⁸ If the purpose of the council is defined, the members and school officials have an easier task of outlining specific functions. Berridge states:

The most important aspect in the organization of a council is the forming of prospective members of the duties and purposes of the council on which they are being asked to serve. ⁷⁹

⁷⁷U.S. Office of Education, loc. cit.

⁷⁸Leslie Kindred, Herbert M. Hamlin, Citizens' Committees in the Public School (Danville, Ill.: Interstate Printing Company, 1952), p. 174.

⁷⁹Robert I. Berridge, The Community Education Handbook (Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1973), p. 103.

Hereford,⁸⁰ Kindred,⁸¹ Linscomb,⁸² Marlow⁸³ and Woons⁸⁴

emphasize written policies or by-laws on the functions of the advisory council. The functions should be agreed upon by the board of education and council members. The functions of the council and board of education should be distinct so that each group does not usurp the authority of the other. This idea is evident in Linscomb's study which revealed that a council operated more effectively when its role was understood by its members.⁸⁵

The membership of a council is to be defined by stating who may be a member and the number of members in each category, if categories are to be developed. Linscomb⁸⁶ and Woons⁸⁷ point out in their findings and recommendations that membership on councils

⁸⁰Karl T. Hereford, Citizens Committees for Public Schools, Vol. XXVII, No. 1, Bulletin of the Bureau of School Service (Lexington: University of Kentucky, 1954), p. 90.

⁸¹Leslie Kindred, School Public Relations (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957), p. 194.

⁸²Linscomb, op. cit., p. 77.

⁸³Frank M. Marlow, Putting Citizen Advisory Committees to Work in Your School (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969), p. 12.

⁸⁴G. J. Woons, "The Community School Council: Functions, Characteristics, and Issues" (unpublished PhD dissertation, Michigan State University, 1972).

⁸⁵Linscomb, op. cit., p. 81.

⁸⁶Ibid.

⁸⁷Woons, loc. cit.

should be broad enough to include school officials as well as lay citizens. Even though a school administrator benefits the council with knowledge, expertise and experience, it was noted that voting privileges were not to be extended to the administrator.

In a study by Tisdale, the findings revealed that a general election is the most appropriate method of selecting an advisory council.⁸⁸ The general election afforded the community the democratic process in which to choose its representatives. The suggested number of members on a council varied slightly but usually ranged in size between fifteen and twenty members. The literature overwhelmingly suggested that the membership term be a definite period of time and that all presiding officers be lay citizens.

Woons⁸⁹ and Marlow⁹⁰ believe that advisory council meetings should be held on a regular basis and in the evenings. Meeting on a regular basis allows members and interested parties the opportunity to plan ahead, and are more practical because the attendance rate is greater. Working parents do not usually attend after school meetings; therefore it is important to schedule them at a time when the attendance is likely to be greater.

FUNCTIONS OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL

The advisory councils surveyed by the previous authors performed

⁸⁸Grace K. Tisdale, "A Survey of Organizational Patterns of School-Community Advisory Groups in the Elementary Schools of the Los Angeles Unified School District" (unpublished EdD dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1971), p. 56.

⁸⁹Woons, loc. cit.

⁹⁰Marlow, loc. cit.

various functions: some simple and others so complex that they needed indepth planning. Councils should invest time in the development of plans and have alternatives for the execution of programs. During initial meetings Fusco believes that basic matters affecting the committee and its operation should be clarified. These should be:

- (1) background of the problem
- (2) nature and scope of the specific purpose or task for which the committee is being formed
- (3) advisory role of the committee and the limits of its authority
- (4) time schedules for conducting and completing the project
- (5) collection of information and data
- (6) assistance needed from school officials and other staff members
- (7) provisions for meeting place and frequency of meetings
- (8) system of reporting to the school board, and
- (9) means of reporting to the community.⁹¹

The general functions of an advisory council were outlined by Kindred in this 1957 book entitled School Public Relations.

- (1) To assist school officials in the development of sound educational policies and programs.
- (2) To identify educational needs and work for the solution of related problems.
- (3) To interpret educational conditions to fellow citizens and enlist their support in seeking improvements.
- (4) To bring community information, opinion and planning into the deliberations of school officials concerned with policy making.
- (5) To influence public attitudes in support of an action program for changes in the school system.
- (6) To harmonize differences in educational points of view between school officials and members of the community.⁹²

⁹¹Gene C. Fusco, Citizens Committees for Better Schools (Washington, D.C.: United States Office of Education, 1964), p. 14.

⁹²Kindred, loc. cit.

Pumphrey's research indicated that advisory councils were best qualified to operate in the decision-making process which dealt with pupil safety, campus security, vandalism, retention of good teachers, homework policies, report cards, curriculum, books and materials, allocation of funds, discipline, and volunteer programs.⁹³ In addition to functions mentioned by Pumphrey, Linscomb also indicated that some councils he had studied were involved with sponsoring and organizing staff development programs which were intended to train the teaching staffs and members of the advisory council.⁹⁴

Caldwell's study showed that all groups surveyed "felt that the councils are presently developing more communication between the schools and community, and improving the relationship of home and school."⁹⁵ This is the usual function that advisory councils have performed in most school situations. Councils have been public relations agents by acting as disseminators of information to both schools and communities. It is also evident from the review of literature that councils need not act simply as public relations agents, but as advocates for community concerns.

ROLES OF ADVISORY COUNCILS

Considering the functions mentioned by Fusco, Kindred, Pumphrey, Linscomb and Caldwell, councils have several roles. The

⁹³W. S. Pumphrey, "The Structure and Organization of Successful Community Advisory Councils in an Emerging Middle-Class Area in the Los Angeles City Schools Districts" (unpublished PhD dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1971).

⁹⁴Linscomb, loc. cit.

⁹⁵Caldwell, op. cit., p. 214.

first role, that of advisor, is one which is typical of most councils. In the study by the National School Public Relations Association, it was revealed that there was great agreement among school officials concerning the role of advisory councils. School officials felt that councils were to be only advisory while parents and citizens indicated the desire that they be more than just advisory.⁹⁶

Another role which has been developing is the one of director. The role of director is one assumed by councils which have greater involvement in policy formation and program development. The advisory council which has the role of director is not common because boards of education do not usually relinquish policy making authority.

The supporter role is one which can be identified with advisory councils. In this role, the advisory council interprets the program and gives "support" to schools officials in promoting the program's goals.⁹⁷ The opposite is the non-supporter role, which is characterized by reactions against the program and a lack of support for school officials.

Berridge points out specific contributions of advisory councils when roles are realized:

- (1) Participation in programs increases.
- (2) The educational "climate" in the community improves.
- (3) The wants and needs of people are made known.

⁹⁶Neild B. Oldham, Citizens Advisory Committees: Public Participation Increases: Guides Change in American Education, (Arlington, VA.: National School Public Relations Association, 1973), p. 9.

⁹⁷Weinstein and Mitchell, op. cit., p. 184.

- (4) Programs are added to meet specific needs.
- (5) A secondary echelon of leadership develops.
- (6) Crisis situations are uncovered and discussed.
- (7) Opinion leaders surface.
- (8) Additional community resources are uncovered.
- (9) An appreciation of the group process is developed as members of the community realize that they represent a voice in their community.⁹⁸

In a recent study Cwik, King and Van Voohees reviewed dissertations dealing with advisory councils and concluded that a new concept was developing in the use of advisory councils. They stated: ". . . a council should be community oriented as well as school oriented."⁹⁹ It seems logical to conclude that to be concerned with the school is to be as concerned with the community. Conant best describes the relationship between the school and the community by stating:

The nature of the community largely determines what goes on in the school. Therefore to attempt to divorce the school from the community is to engage in unrealistic thinking, which might lead to policies that could wreak havoc with the school and the lives of children. The community and the school are inseparable.¹⁰⁰

SUMMARY

Advocates of advisory councils assert that the councils may provide the democratic process for citizens interested in the decision-making process. Advisory councils are providing communities

⁹⁸Berridge, op. cit., p. 98.

⁹⁹Peter J. Cwik, Marilyn J. King and Curtis Van Voorhees, The Community Advisory Council (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, 1975), p. 1.

¹⁰⁰Sumption and Engstrom, op. cit., forward by James B. Conant.

the opportunity to have input in all aspects of school programs.

The concept of participation is not new. What is new to the concept of participation is that minority groups have tried to take part in this democratic process.

Congress has taken the leadership role in assuring minorities the rights enjoyed by the majority of citizens in the United States. The United States Constitution did not originally guarantee rights to all people in the United States. All citizens were given their rights to life, liberty, property, due process, equal protection under the law, and the right to vote when Congress passed the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, Fifteenth and Nineteenth Amendments.

It was not, however, until the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 that all citizens regardless of race, national origin, religion or sex, were guaranteed full rights. Minorities now had the federal government assuring their right to vote, to use public accommodations and non-discrimination in federally assisted programs. With respect to federally assisted educational programs, linguistic minorities have been afforded equal educational opportunities by the passage of the Bilingual Education Acts of 1968 and 1974.

In addition to voting rights and non-discrimination in federally assisted programs, Congress has also recognized the importance of citizen participation in federal programs. The role of citizen participation was initiated by the passage of EOA of 1964 and ESEA of 1965. Federal legislation with respect to participation was, and is

still, stated in general terms. However, the language describing advisory councils in categorical programs such as Bilingual Education is more specific.

The literature reveals the importance of advisory councils and that the success of these councils is often related to a structured and systematic method of operation. It was pointed out in several studies that by-laws or a constitution should be developed by the advisory council. The purpose of the advisory council should be clearly and precisely stated in the by-laws or in the constitution. The functions and limitations of authority should be stated as well and agreed upon by the advisory council members and the board of education.

The studies pointed out that advisory councils were best qualified to identify educational needs and assist school officials in developing solutions for these needs. Research also indicated that advisory councils are also performing many functions which develop communications between school and community.

The roles of advisory councils were classified in terms of advisor, director, supporter or non-supporter. Most councils are advisory in nature even though they may direct or support the educational programs.

The advisory council can bring about many positive contributions to the school and community. It is worthy to note that many councils are now oriented toward the community rather than exclusively

to the school. Both the roles and functions derived from the literature search served as the basis for the investigation of how leadership figures on the council and in the school perceived these roles and functions.

Chapter 3

PROCEDURES

The purpose of this study was to identify and examine the roles and functions of Spanish-speaking parent advisory councils serving bilingual education project with grades K-8 funded under ESEA Title VII. In order to obtain data concerning these roles and functions, it was necessary to survey those persons who were the closest to the parent advisory council. The parent advisory council chairpersons, school principals and project directors were those identified as having the most information because of their close relationship with the parent advisory councils.

The participants in the study ranked the roles and functions according to their perceived importance. The agreement within each group, based on the ranking of roles and functions, was analyzed using a nonparametric statistical test. It was appropriate to choose this method of analysis because according to Siegel:

Nonparametric statistical tests are available to treat data which are inherently in ranks as well as data whose seemingly numerical scores have the strengths of ranks.¹

In order to test the differences in perceptions of participants with respect to independent variables identified in the six hypotheses,

¹Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics For The Behavioral Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956), p. 33.

it was also necessary to perform a multivariate analysis. This was possible by utilizing the subprogram discriminant analysis. William R. Klecker explains the objective of utilizing discriminant analysis:

Discriminant analysis begins with the desire to statistically distinguish between two or more groups of cases. To distinguish between the groups, the researcher selects a collection of discriminating variables that measure characteristics. . . The mathematical objective of discriminant analysis is to weigh and linearly combine the discriminating variables in some fashion so that the groups are forced to be as statistically distinct as possible.²

Descriptions of the nonparametric statistical procedures and the multivariate analysis used to analyze the data collected from the respondents are included in this chapter. The population and the sample for the study are also discussed, as well as the sampling technique. The chapter also includes information on the following: the development of the research instrument, the pilot test for clarity of instructions and items, the administration of the research instrument and the data collection procedures.

THE INSTRUMENT

The instrument (see Appendix A) utilized in this study was specifically designed and tested to identify the respondents' perceptions of the roles and functions of parent advisory councils mandated by Congress in bilingual projects funded by ESEA Title VII. A review of the literature related to advisory councils revealed that

²Norman H. Nie and others, Statistical Package For The Social Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company, 1975), p. 435.

no instrument had been developed specifically to examine the questions put forth in this study. In order to obtain the needed data, it was necessary to develop an instrument which accounted for roles and functions of parent advisory councils in bilingual projects with respect to the positions of the advisory council chairpersons, school principals and project directors.

The literature search revealed four basic roles assumed by advisory councils. Cronin and Thomas felt that the roles of advisor, director and supporter generally characterized councils.³ Information found in the report entitled Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, supported a fourth role: that of non-supporter.⁴

The literature revealed that advisory councils were generally characterized as advisory in nature, but there were indications that some councils desired more than just an advisory type role. Councils wanting more involvement in the decision making process appeared to be demanding a role characterized as director. Other councils were termed as supporters and their activities did not usually deal with recommendations and never dealt with the development of directives, but almost always dealt with support for school officials in attaining goals. The non-supporter role chosen by some advisory councils appeared to be based on council reactions against the program in question and is characterized by an almost total lack of support

³Thomas E. Cronin and Norman C. Thomas, "Federal Advisory Processes: Advice and Discontent," *Science*, CLXXI (February, 1971), 771.

⁴Gerald C. Sumner and others, Federal Programs Supporting Education Change Vol. III: The Process of Change (Santa Monica, Ca.: The Rand Corporation, 1975).

of school officials in achieving program goals. It was recognized by the researcher that all four roles can be present in any one advisory council, but that a council usually associates itself with one major role.

The four roles for advisory councils were defined in the research instrument and randomly listed. The instructions requested that the defined roles be ranked by the participants according to primacy. Number 1 was considered the highest rank and the numbers 2, 3, and 4 followed in descending value.

Functions of advisory councils to be used as items on the research instruments were selected from Caldwell,⁵ Linscomb,⁶ Kindred,⁷ Marlow,⁸ Pumphrey,⁹ and Woons.¹⁰ The researcher also included some functions which were not generally found to be performed by the advisory council, but almost always reserved for the board of

⁵T.P. Caldwell, "An Assessment of Arizona Community School Administrators Concerning School-Community Advisory Councils in Educational Decision-Making" (unpublished PhD dissertation, the University of Michigan, 1974), p. 67.

⁶J.P. Linscomb, "The Structure and Organization of Successful Community Advisory Councils in an Inner-City Area of Los Angeles City Unified School District" (unpublished PhD Dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1972), p. 81.

⁷Leslie Kindred, Herbert M. Hamlin, Citizens' Committees in the Public School (Danville, Ill.: Interstate Printing Company, 1952), p.174.

⁸Frank M. Marlow, Putting Citizen Advisory Committees to Work in Your School (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969), p. 12.

⁹W.S. Pumphrey, "The Structure and Organization of Successful Community Advisory Councils in an Emerging Middle-Class Area in the Los Angeles City School Districts" (unpublished PhD dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1971).

¹⁰G.J. Woons, "The Community School Council: Functions, Characteristics, and Issues" (unpublished PhD dissertation, Michigan State University, 1972).

education, i.e. budget planning, personnel policies, planning of school facilities, and evaluation of students, teachers and administrators.

The roles were defined in the questionnaire and listed in a manner whereby respondents could rank the roles. The functions were listed under three program areas: planning, implementation and evaluation.¹¹ The functions under these three program areas were listed in such a fashion which allowed the respondents to rank the functions according to primacy.

In addition to roles and functions, information related to the organizational aspects of the advisory council was requested. This information was used to characterize the advisory councils in bilingual projects with respect to by-laws, membership, meetings, voting privileges and limits of authority.

PILOT TEST

After the development of the research instrument is seemed appropriate to check for clarity of the instructions and items to be read by the participants.

In order to further check for clarity of instructions and items, the research instrument was given to thirty graduate students in administrative courses at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in Northern Virginia to estimate the clarity of the

¹¹The three program areas were listed in the original suggested guidelines for parent advisory councils. United States Office of Education, Manual for Project Applicants and Grantees (Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1971), p. 67.

instrument. They were asked to indicate their response as to whether or not the directions and items on the questionnaire were easily understood. A Likert-like scale was developed with four choices expressing different degrees of understanding, i.e. "easily understood," "understood," "poorly understood" and "not understood." There were four sections in the questionnaire and the respondents indicated their degree of understanding of the directions for each section. Calculating the responses for each section resulted in Section I being "easily understood," Section II "easily understood," Section III "understood" and Section IV "easily understood." As a result of the overall rating of Section III, a minor change was necessary in the instructions for the purpose of clarity. No other changes were deemed necessary.

RESEARCH SUBJECTS

The population for this study consisted of parent advisory council chairpersons, school principals and project directors from Spanish-English bilingual projects with grades K-8. It was important that the subjects in the sample be drawn at random from the population. Ferguson defines a random sample by saying that it ". . . is one that every member of the population has an equal probability of being included in it."¹²

The word "random" implies certain operations or methods in the selection procedure. The researcher chose the technique of

¹²George A. Ferguson, Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1976), p. 131.

systematic sampling in order to randomly select subjects for the study. Ary, Jacobs and Razavich explain the technique of systematic sampling as follows:

One first decides how many subjects he wants in the sample (n). Since he knows the total numbers of members in the population (N), he simply divides N by n and determines the sampling interval (k) to apply to the list. The first member is randomly selected from the first k members of the list and then every kth member of the population is selected for the sample.¹³

According to McGrath: "A large population may be adequately sampled with 10 percent or less for the sample."¹⁴ Using the percentage stated by McGrath, the sample for this study consisted of advisory council chairpersons, school principals and project directors from 21 Spanish-English bilingual education projects with grades K-8, selected by the systematic sampling technique. The population of advisory council chairpersons, school principals and project directors from 210 Spanish-English Bilingual Education Projects with grades K-8 was considered large because these projects accounted for seventy-seven percent of the approximate 190,000 total of Spanish-speaking children enrolled in bilingual education.¹⁵

¹³ Donald Ary, Lucy C. Jacobs and Asghar Razavich, Introduction to Research in Education (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1972), p. 166.

¹⁴ J. H. McGrath, Research Methods and Designs for Education (Scranton, Pa.: International Textbook Company, 1970), p. 127.

¹⁵ Education Service Center, Region XII, Guide To Title VII ESEA Bilingual-Bicultural Programs 1976-1977 (Austin, Texas: Dissemination and Assessment Center for Bilingual Education, 1977).

The lists of bilingual education projects funded by the U.S. Office of Education, with approval of the Office of Bilingual Education, were obtained from the Guide To Title VII ESEA Bilingual-Bicultural Programs 1976-1977 developed by the Education Service Center under a grant from the U.S. Office of Education. The 21 bilingual projects (See Appendix B) utilized in the study provided at least 21 subjects to be participants from each of the three following groups:

1. Parent Advisory Councils Chairpersons in bilingual programs with grades K-8.
2. School Principals in bilingual programs with grades K-8.
3. Project Directors in bilingual programs with grades K-8.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE INSTRUMENT

An introductory letter (see Appendix C) was sent to all subjects in the sample requesting participatory support for the study and an explanation of the procedures involved. Another letter (see Appendix C) also requesting participatory support and signed by Dr. Donald K. Sharpes, accompanied the first letter.

A packet, with the two letters, the research instrument and a self-addressed stamped envelope was mailed to each participant. The participants were informed that the purpose of the study was to identify and examine the roles and functions of parent advisory councils serving bilingual projects. The participants were assured that the

information obtained would be confidential and that no information would be directly related to individual schools or school systems. They were requested to read and respond to each item on the questionnaire by marking the appropriate answer in the space provided. Time was of prime importance and the participants' efforts in promptly returning the completed questionnaire was also requested in the cover letter. Space was provided at the end of the questionnaire so that respondents could indicate whether or not they wanted to receive results of the study.

COLLECTION OF THE DATA

Participants were sent the packets by first class mail. A second packet including a letter (see Appendix C) and research instrument was sent to all participants ten days after the initial mailing to insure a high rate of return. A third packet including a letter (see Appendix C) and research instrument was sent to the participants who had not returned the questionnaire seven days after the second packet was sent out. Only research instruments received within twenty-one working days after the initial mailing were accepted for processing. A coding sheet was developed, which facilitated the recording of responses from the instruments. After the coding sheets were completed, the responses were then keypunched on computer cards for data analysis.

TREATMENT OF THE DATA

Upon completion of recording the data on computer cards and validation of this procedure by a key punch specialist, the data were

ready for analysis. Computer programs employed for the data analysis in this study were obtained from Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), which is a comprehensive system of computer programs specifically designed for the analysis of social science data.¹⁶

A nonparametric test, the Kendall coefficient of concordance W , was used to determine the degree of the agreement among the advisory council chairpersons, school principals and project directors with respect to the ranking of roles and functions of parent advisory councils in bilingual projects. Siegel points out that:

A high or significant value of W may be interpreted as meaning that the observers or judges are applying essentially the same standard in ranking the N objects under study.¹⁷

The Kendall coefficient of concordance W is defined by the following formula:

$$W = \frac{s}{\frac{1}{12} k^2 (N^3 - N)}$$

where s = sum of squares of the observed deviations from the mean of R_j , that is, $s = \sum (R_j - \frac{R_j}{N})^2$

k = number of sets of ranking, e.g. the number of judges

N = number of entities (objects of individuals) ranked

$\frac{1}{12} k^2 (N^3 - N)$ = maximum possible sum of the squared deviations, i.e., the sum s which would occur with perfect agreement among k rankings¹⁸

¹⁶Nie, op. cit., p. 11.

¹⁷Siegel, op. cit., p. 237.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 231.

A multivariate analysis was utilized in order to test the statistical significance of the variables identified in the six hypotheses on the ranking of roles and functions. In order to be able to perform the multivariate analysis, it was necessary to transform the rankings of each role and function into normalized scores. Dixon and Massey state: "In some cases it is desirable to force the observations into a normal distribution."¹⁹

Guilford supports the transformation of rankings into normalized scores by stating: "Tests made of statistics on transformed scales lead to conclusions that hold for the natural phenomena under investigation."²⁰ After the transformations were made the Subprogram Discriminant Analysis was utilized.

The Subprogram Discriminant Analysis computes Wilk's Lambda which is:

. . . an inverse measure of the discriminating power in the original variables which has not yet been removed by the discriminant functions -- the larger Lambda is, the less information remaining, Lambda can be transformed into a Chi-square statistic for an easy test of statistical significance.²¹

Discriminant analysis attempts to statistically distinguish between two or more groups of cases by forming one or more linear

¹⁹Wilfrid J. Dixon and Frank J. Massey, Jr., Introduction to Statistical Analysis (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969), p. 325.

²⁰J. P. Guilford, Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973), pp. 214-215.

²¹Nie, op. cit., p. 442.

combinations of the discriminating variables. These discriminant functions are defined by the formula:

$$D_i = d_{i1}Z_1 + d_{i2}Z_2 + \dots d_{ip}Z_p$$

where D_i = the score on the discriminant function i

the d 's = weighting coefficients

the Z 's = the standardized values of the p discriminating variables used in the analysis.²²

The .05 level of significance was chosen for both tests in this study, the Kendall Coefficient of Concordance W and the Discriminant Analysis which computes Wilk's Lambda. The use of the .05 level of significance indicates that when the probability of the difference between the two or more groups occurring by chance is 5 or less in 100 instances, it is statistically significant at the .05 level. If the difference between the perceptions of the two or more groups is so large that it cannot be statistically attributed to chance, then it may be stated that the difference is statistically significant and the null hypothesis is rejected. However, if the difference between the perceptions of the two or more groups is so small that it can be attributed to chance, then it may be stated that the difference is not statistically significant and the null hypothesis is accepted.

SUMMARY

Chapter 3 presents the procedures employed in the study. The research instrument for this study was developed to obtain the perceptions of advisory council chairpersons, school principals and

²²Ibid.

project directors toward roles and functions of parent advisory councils in bilingual projects. The instrument included roles and functions which were to be ranked according to primacy by the participants. The instrument also included items which would be used to characterize the parent advisory councils with respect to by-laws, membership, meetings, agendas, reporting to the community and limits of authority.

The pilot test enabled the researcher to check for clarity of instructions and items. The graduate students were asked to complete the Likert-like scale developed to test whether instructions and items were easily understood, understood, poorly understood or not understood.

The population for the study and the sample for the study were described, as well as the sampling technique used by the researcher. The procedures employed in sending the research instruments to the participants and the letters accompanying the instrument were discussed. Also discussed were the collection of the data and the statistical tests used in the analysis of the data obtained from respondents. The .05 level of significance was selected with respect to accepting or rejecting the null hypotheses.

Chapter 4

PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, AND DISCUSSION OF DATA

The purpose of this chapter was to present information concerning the analysis of the research findings. Included in this chapter is information covering the administration of the research instrument, the collection of data, the statistical program utilized in processing the data, descriptive information on the parent advisory councils and an examination of the six hypotheses.

The demographic data in this chapter is presented in an effort to characterize the parent advisory councils serving Spanish-English bilingual projects. The demographic data includes information on the respondents with respect to sex, age level, education level, bilingualism, ethnicity, and position. The parent advisory councils represented by the three groups of participants were described with respect to the organization, composition, recognition and authority of parent advisory councils.

GENERAL DATA

The Parent Advisory Council Questionnaire was administered by mail to chairpersons, principals and project directors of bilingual education projects. The study utilized twenty-one bilingual projects throughout the United States. The projects were selected from Spanish-English projects with grades Kindergarten through eight funded

under ESEA Title VII. Included in the sample were twenty-one participants from each group of chairpersons, principals and project directors. Of the sixty-three questionnaires that were mailed, fourteen chairpersons responded or sixty-seven percent; fifteen principals responded or seventy-one percent and twenty project directors responded or ninety-five percent. The total forty-nine questionnaires returned accounted for a return rate of seventy-seven percent. Incomplete questionnaires were not discarded. If the respondent did not complete an item, the item was treated as missing data and accounted for in the processing of the data. The number of Parent Advisory Council Questionnaires mailed to participants, the number of Questionnaires returned and the corresponding percentages, are shown in Table 1.

In the analysis of the data, no attempts were made to identify individuals or bilingual projects. The views of the non-respondents are unknown and could have altered the data of the study.

DATA ANALYSIS

The data concerning the organization and composition of the councils were processed using Subprogram Frequencies: One-Way Distributions with Descriptive Statistics, from the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer programs. The SPSS manual states, "Frequencies enable the user to calculate, along with the distribution tables, any or all of the descriptive statistics. . .¹

¹Nie and others, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1975), p. 194.

Table 1

Numbers and Percentages of Distributed and Returned
Questionnaires By Position of Respondents

Position of Respondents	Number of Questionnaires Distributed	Number of Questionnaires Returned	Percentage of Questionnaires Returned
Chairpersons	21	14	67
Principals	21	15	71
Project Directors	21	20	95
Totals	63	49	77

The statistical data concerning the degree of agreement within each group of chairpersons, principals and project directors on the ranking of roles and functions was calculated by utilizing the Kendall Coefficient of Concordance W explained in Chapter 3. The differences of perceptions between the groups identified by the variables: sex, age level, education level, bilingualism, ethnicity and position were analyzed by using the Subprogram Discriminant Analysis also explained in Chapter 3.

DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION ON COUNCILS

Questions were asked of the participants which would allow an analysis and categorization of respondents. Tables 2 and 3 show the breakdown of the forty-nine respondents into male and female categories, as well as a detailed distribution of males and females by each group of participants. The groups of chairpersons and project directors were almost evenly divided between male and female, with chairpersons having eight males and six females and the group of project directors being exactly divided with ten males and ten females. The group of principals was not similar to the other two groups in respect to the number of male and female respondents. The group of principals had thirteen males and two females.

Age level was the second question which participants were asked to complete on the questionnaire. There were four age level selections possible: 21-30, 31-40, 41-50 and 51 and over. The 31-40 age level accounted for the largest number of respondents, seventeen

Table 2
Numbers and Percentages of Male
and Female Respondents

Respondents	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Male	31	63.3
Female	18	36.7
Totals	49	100.0

Table 3

Distribution of Respondents by
Position and Gender

Position of Respondents	Male	Female	Row Total
Chairpersons	8	6	14
Principals	13	2	15
Project Directors	10	10	20
Total of Males and Females	31	18	49
Percentage of Males and Females	63.3	36.7	100.0

or 34.7 percent of all respondents. The 21-30 age level received the smallest number of respondents, eight or 16.3 percent of the respondents. A more detailed breakdown of groups by age level indicated that the principals were the only respondents not to be included in the 21-30 age level. The other two groups had respondents from each of the age level categories. Tables 4 and 5 show the data concerning the age levels of participants, with the latter table showing the distribution of age levels by each group.

The participants were asked to indicate on the questionnaire the highest education level they had attained. The lowest education level was K-6 but no respondent indicated this education level as his highest level, therefore Table 6 does not show a column labeled K-6. There was only one respondent who indicated the highest education level of 7-9, and two respondents with education levels of 10-12. Two respondents had high school diplomas and three had had some college. Five of the respondents had bachelors degrees. The education level with the largest number of respondents was the masters level with thirty-two. The doctorate level of education had four respondents.

Table 7 illustrates the distribution of respondents by education level. According to the data received from the respondents, there was at least one person from the group of chairpersons in every education level. The largest number of principals reported an M.A.-M.S. education level. The group of project directors was similar to the principals. The M.A.-M.S. education level accounted for the largest number of project directors, seventeen. The three groups with individuals

Table 4
Age Levels of Respondents

Age Levels	Number of Respondents By Age Level	Percentage of Respondents By Age Level
21-30	8	16.3
31-40	17	34.7
41-50	15	30.6
51 and over	9	18.4
Total	49	100.0

Table 5

Distribution of Respondents by
Position and Age Level

Position of Respondents	21-30	31-40	41-50	51 and over
Chairperson	4	3	4	3
Principal	0	7	4	4
Project Director	4	7	7	2
Column Total	8	17	15	9
Percentage	16.3	34.7	30.6	18.4

Table 6
Education Level of Respondents

Education Level	Number of Respondents By Education Level	Percentage of Respondents By Education Level
7-9	1	2.0
10-12	2	4.1
H.S. Diploma	2	4.1
Some College	3	6.1
B.A.-B.S.	5	10.2
M.A.-M.S.	32	65.3
Ph.D.-Ed.D.	4	8.2
Total	49	100.0

Table 7

Distribution of Respondents by Position and
Education Level

Position of Respondents	7-9	10-12	H.S. Dipl.	Some Coll.	B.A. B.S.	M.A. M.S.	Ph.D. Ed.D.
Chairpersons	1	2	2	3	3	2	1
Principal	0	0	0	0	1	13	1
Project Director	0	0	0	0	1	17	2
Education Level Total	1	2	2	3	5	32	4

who indicated the M.S.-M.S. level as the highest education level attained, made up the largest number of thirty-two persons or 65.3 percent of all respondents.

It is understandable that the respondents from the group of chairpersons fill each education level, since there is no education requirement in order to be appointed chairperson. There are, however, education requirements for positions such as principals and project directors. Therefore it seems appropriate that there would be few, if any principals or project directors with less than a B.S. or B.A. degree.

The ethnic background of each respondent was also obtained. The largest number of respondents, thirty-one or 63.3 percent, indicated that they were Mexican-American. The second largest number, fifteen or 30.6 percent, had checked the space on the questionnaire labeled: "Other (explain)_____." The fifteen persons who checked "Other" were evenly divided between the following backgrounds: Dutch, French, German, Irish, and Mexican. The ethnic background labeled Puerto Rican had two persons making up 4.1 percent of the total. The category labeled Cuban-American had only one person. Table 8 shows the count for each category.

Table 9 illustrates distribution by position by ethnic background. Chairpersons had eight Mexican-Americans which accounted for 57.1 percent of the chairpersons, one Puerto Rican, one Cuban-American and four in the category labeled Other. There were nine

Table 8

Ethnic Background of Respondents

Ethnic Background	Number of Respondents by Ethnic Background	Percentage of Respondents by Ethnic Background
Mexican-American	31	63.3
Puerto Rican	2	4.1
Cuban-American	1	2.0
Other	15	30.6
Total	49	100.0

Table 9
 Distribution of Respondents by Position
 by Ethnic Background

Position of Respondents	Mexican American	Puerto Rican	Cuban American	Other
Chairperson	8	1	1	4
Principal	9	0	0	6
Project Director	14	1	0	5
Ethnic Background Total	31	2	1	15

Mexican-American principals and no principals in either the category labeled Puerto Rican or Cuban-American. There were, however, six principals in the category labeled Other. Project directors accounted for fourteen in the category Mexican-American, one Puerto Rican, no Cuban-Americans and five in the category Other.

The 63.3 percent Mexican-American ethnic background reported is not surprising given the fact that 80.0 percent of the bilingual projects randomly chosen came from geographical areas where a large percentage of the population was Mexican-American.

The participants were to mark YES or NO on the questionnaire, with respect to whether or not they were Spanish-English bilinguals. Table 10 shows that thirty-seven respondents, 75.5 percent (relative frequency) or 77.1 percent (adjusted frequency) were Spanish-English bilinguals. There were eleven who responded that they were not Spanish-English bilinguals and one who did not answer the question. (Unanswered questions were treated as missing data and thus Table 10 shows two percentages for each category).

Table 11 provides some information concerning the number and percentage within each group surveyed who are Spanish-English bilinguals and those who are not bilingual. There were nine chairpersons who answered yes to this question, while four persons from this group indicated that they were not Spanish-English bilinguals. With respect to principals, ten answered yes and five no. The project directors had the largest number, eighteen or 90.8 percent

Table 10

Spanish-English Bilingual
Ability of Respondents

Bilingual	Number of Respondents	Relative Percentage	Adjusted Percentage
Yes	37	75.5	77.1
No	11	22.4	29.9
No data	1	2.0	Missing
Total	49	100.0	100.0

Table 11

Distribution of Respondents by Position by
Spanish-English Bilinguals

Position of Respondents	Spanish-English Bilinguals	%	Non Spanish-English Bilinguals	%
Chairpersons	9	18.7	4	8.3
Principals	10	20.8	5	10.4
Project Directors	18	37.6	2	4.2
Bilingual and Non-Bilingual Totals	37		11	
Percentages of Bilinguals and Non-Bilinguals		77.1		22.9

answering yes to his question. Only two project directors indicated that they were not Spanish-English bilinguals.

It is evident from the question on Spanish-English bilingualism of the participants that 77.1 percent responding yes to Spanish-English bilingualism is quite large. This high percentage of participants who responded that they were Spanish-English bilinguals is to be expected given the fact that 80.0 percent of the bilingual projects in the study are in areas of the country where a large percentage of the population is Mexican-American.

The participants were asked to indicate of what ethnic majority their councils were comprised. Of the forty-nine respondents, thirty-seven or 75.5 percent felt that the majority of the council was Mexican-American. Seven respondents or 14.3 percent stated that their council was primarily Puerto Rican, while five responded to the category of Other; which indicated no clear majority but a combination of ethnic backgrounds. Table 12 reports the ethnic background of the parent advisory councils.

Participants were also asked to indicate the method by which the parent advisory council chairperson was chosen. Thirty-nine respondents or 97.6 percent indicated that the chairperson was elected by the council. The second method, appointment of the chairperson by the principal or project director, was indicated by seven respondents or 14.3 percent. Only two respondents indicated that the chairperson had been appointed by a community organization.

Table 12

Ethnic Background of Parent Advisory Council

Ethnic Background	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Mexican-American	37	75.3
Puerto Rican	7	14.3
Other	5	10.2
Totals	49	100.0

There was one respondent who marked the category labeled Other on the questionnaire and explained that the chairperson had been temporarily appointed by the principal until there could be an election by the council. Table 13 shows the data concerning how chairpersons were chosen.

According to 57.1 percent of the respondents, general membership was made up of volunteers. This is not what the review of literature had revealed about advisory councils in general. The literature had indicated that general membership was primarily by election. General membership on councils was also attained by election according to 26.5 percent of the respondents. Only four respondents or 8.2 percent indicated appointment to the council as a method for selecting general membership. Three respondents marked the category labeled "Other" and explained that a combination of electing and volunteering took place on their respective councils. (One respondent did not answer this question, thus the reason for the two columns of percentages). (Refer to Table 14 for these data).

The literature indicated that the councils were generally comprised of fifteen to twenty members. The councils represented by the respondents differed somewhat from the number of members reported in the literature. The two largest percentages of respondents, 28.6 and 24.5, indicated that councils were comprised of ten to fifteen and more than twenty members respectively. Table 15 reports to the data concerning the number of members on the councils.

Table 13

Method of Selection of Chairpersons

Method of Selection	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Elected by Council	39	79.6
Appointed by Principal or Project Director	7	14.3
Appointed by Community Organization	2	4.1
Other	1	2.0
Total	1	100.0

Table 14

Method of Selection of Advisory Council Members

Method of Selection	Number of Respondents	Relative Percentage	Adjusted Percentage
Election	13	26.5	27.1
Appointment	4	8.2	8.3
Volunteer	28	57.1	58.3
Other	3	6.1	6.3
Missing Data	1	2.0	Missing
Totals	49	100.0	100.0

Table 15

Number of Parent Advisory Council Members

PAC Number of Members on a Council	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
3-5	5	10.2
6-9	9	18.4
10-15	14	28.6
16-20	9	18.4
More than 20	12	24.5
Totals	49	100.0

The term for parent advisory council members, in 68.1 percent of the councils, was a one-year term. Three or more years was the term for 19.1 percent of the councils and a two-year term was typical in only 12.8 percent of the councils. (Two respondents did not answer this question and thus the two columns of percentages which take into consideration the missing data). The literature did not make reference to a preferred length of membership but did suggest that a definite term of membership was appropriate for the proper functioning of the council. Table 16 provides data regarding terms of membership.

The number of males on the parent advisory council was the next question that the participants were asked to answer. Twenty-eight respondents or 59.6 percent indicated that males on the parent advisory council numbered less than half. The second largest percentage of respondents indicated that at least half of the membership on their councils was comprised of males. Eight respondents or 16.3 percent indicated that there were no males on their respective councils. (Two respondents did not answer this question). Table 17 shows the number of respondents and their respective answers.

The question asking whether or not half of the parent advisory council members were parents with children enrolled in the bilingual program was asked to determine if there was any non-compliance with rules and regulations as developed by the U.S. Office of Education. There were forty-six respondents or 93.9 percent who indicated that the councils they represented were in compliance

Table 16

Terms of Parent Advisory Council Members

Length of Term of Membership on Council	Number of Respondents	Relative Percentages	Adjusted Percentages
1 year	32	65.3	68.1
2 years	6	12.2	12.8
3 years or more	9	18.4	19.1
Missing Data	2	4.1	Missing
Totals	49	100.0	100.0

Table 17

Relative Number of Males on Parent Advisory Council

Relative Number of Males	Number of Respondents	Relative Percentage	Adjusted Percentage
None	8	16.3	17.0
Less Than Half	28	57.1	59.6
Half	9	18.4	19.1
More Than Half	2	4.1	4.3
Missing Data	2	4.1	Missing
Totals	49	100.0	100.0

with respect to the requirement that half of the membership consist of parents with children enrolled in the bilingual program. There were three respondents or 6.1 percent who indicated that the councils they represented were not in compliance with this regulation. Table 18 shows the percentage of councils with membership which was at least half comprised of parents with children enrolled in the bilingual program.

The next question asking the length of the orientation program was prompted by the review of literature. The literature indicated that advisory councils function more efficiently when roles and functions are explained. Table 19 illustrates how the respondents answered the question concerning the orientation program for advisory council members. Twenty-seven respondents or 56.3 percent indicated that the orientation program was more than one day. There were three respondents who indicated that there was no orientation program for their councils. (One respondent did not answer this question and thus the two columns of percentages in Table 19).

The next two questions which were asked of the participants were related. The first of the two questions asked if there existed a formal plan or statement by the board of education or by the superintendent recognizing the parent advisory council. Table 20 shows that this question received thirty affirmative responses for a total of 63.8 percent. The second of the two related questions reported in Table 21 asked participants if the board of education or the superintendent specified the limits of authority for the parent

Table 18

Half or more of PAC Parents with
Children In Bilingual Program

Responses	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Yes	46	93.9
No	3	6.1
Totals	49	100.0

Table 19

Length of Orientation Program for Parent Advisory Council

Type of Orientation	Number of Respondents	Relative Percentage	Adjusted Percentage
None	3	6.1	6.3
Less Than Half Day	27	55.1	56.3
Half Day	6	12.1	12.5
All Day	2	4.1	4.2
More Than One Day	10	20.4	20.8
Missing	1	2.0	Missing
Totals	49	100.0	100.0

Table 20

Existence of Formal School Board Policy Statement or
Administrative Recognition of Parent Advisory
Council

Formal Plan or Statement by School Board or Superintendent	Number of Respondents	Relative Percentage	Adjusted Percentage
Yes	30	61.2	63.8
No	17	34.7	36.2
Missing	2	4.1	Missing
Totals	49	100.0	100.0

Table 21

The Limits of Authority for Parent Advisory Council
Are Specified By Local School Board of
Superintendent

Response if Limits of Authority Specified	Number of Respondents	Relative Percentage	Adjusted Percentage
Yes	20	40.8	42.6
No	27	55.1	57.4
Missing	2	4.1	Missing
Total	49	100.0	100.0

advisory council. Such information might indicate why some councils do not function effectively, for a large percentage, 63.8 percent, there was recognition by the board of education or by the superintendent but an almost equally high percentage, 57.4, reporting that the limits of authority were not specified.

The next two questions were also related. The first of the two questions asked participants to indicate if there had been a parent advisory council prior to the bilingual education program. Half of the respondents, 51 percent, indicated an affirmative answer to this question. The second of these questions asked participants to indicate if a parent advisory council on bilingual education existed prior to the preparation of the proposal submitted to the Office of Bilingual Education. To this question, 65.9 percent of the respondents answered yes while a surprising 34.1 percent answered no. Five respondents failed to answer this question which was the largest number for any unanswered item in the questionnaire. The 34.1 percent of the respondents who answered in the negative, clearly suggests non-compliance in the proper preparation of the proposal or shows that the specific respondents answering no had no knowledge of the existence of an advisory planning group. The rules and regulations developed by the U.S. Office of Education, clearly state that parents and community must be involved in the preparation of the proposal prior to its submittal for review to the Office of Bilingual Education. Tables 22 and 23 array the responses to these items, along with corresponding percentages.

Table 22

Parent Advisory Council Existence Prior to
Federal Bilingual Education Funding

Prior PAC Existence	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Yes	25	51.0
No	24	49.0
Totals	49	100.0

Table 23

Existence of Parent Advisory Council on Bilingual Education
Prior To Preparation of Federal Proposal

PAC Involvement Prior to Development of Federal Proposal	Number of Respondents	Relative Percentage	Adjusted Percentage
Yes	29	59.2	65.9
No	15	30.6	34.1
Missing	5	10.2	Missing
Totals	49	100.0	100.0

The next eight questions related to the manner in which parent advisory councils in bilingual education functioned. The first of these questions asked how the councils functioned with respect to formal or informal procedures. The largest percentage of respondents, 39.6 percent, indicated that the councils functioned in a formal manner with written rules. The next largest percentage of respondents, 37.5 percent, indicated that their councils were informal with the rules understood. The last two categories checked by respondents suggested informal council structure with no rules and/or formal councils with unwritten rules. See Table 24 for these data.

The responses to the next question indicated that 71.4 percent of the respondents stated that their parent advisory councils held meetings in the schools. The second largest group 22.4 percent of all respondents, indicated that their councils held meetings on a rotating basis between the school, the community center and homes. Three respondents or 6.1 percent indicated that meetings were held in the community center. There were no respondents who indicated that meetings were held in homes only. These data indicate that the school is the most common meeting place for the council. Table 25 illustrates these data.

The literature revealed that council meetings should be held on a regular basis and at least once a month. The respondents' answers clearly indicate that parent advisory councils in bilingual education schedule meetings in this format. According to 85.6 percent

Table 24

Respondents' Perceptions of How Parent
Advisory Council Functions

Method of Functioning	Number of Respondents	Relative Percentage	Adjusted Percentage
Formal with Unwritten Rules	3	6.1	6.3
Formal with Written Rules	19	38.8	39.6
Informal but Understood Rules	18	36.7	37.5
Informal with No Rules	8	16.3	16.7
Missing	1	2.0	Missing
Totals	49	100.0	100.0

Table 25

Where Parent Advisory Councils Meet

Location of Meetings	Number of Respondents	Percentage
School	35	71.4
Community Center	3	6.1
Homes	0	0.0
Rotating	11	22.4
Totals	49	100.0

of the respondents, parent advisory councils meet on a monthly basis, while only 6.1 percent of the respondents indicated that councils meet twice a month. There were no respondents who indicated weekly meetings by councils. There were four respondents or 8.2 percent who marked the category labeled "Other," which was to be explained by the respondent. Those who marked "Other" indicated that the meetings were held whenever necessary at the discretion of the chairperson. Table 26 illustrates the data.

According to the literature, evening meetings are preferred to daytime meetings. The literature showed the rate of attendance was greater when evening meetings were held, since working parents cannot usually attend day meetings but can attend evening meetings. Advisory councils in bilingual education surveyed seemed generally in compliance with the prevailing philosophy. Twenty-eight respondents or 57.1 percent indicated that parent advisory council meetings were reportedly held exclusively in the evening. Ten respondents or 20.4 percent indicated that meetings were held during the school day, while the remaining eleven respondents or 22.4 percent stated that their parent advisory councils used a combination of times instead of one or the other. Table 27 shows these data.

Participants were also asked if the council participated in the development of the agenda for meetings. Some reports have suggested that administrators and teachers have been over zealous in planning the agenda for councils and thereby assuming some, if not all, of the control from the council members. Forty-two respondents or 12.5 percent stated that the council did not participate

Table 26

How Often Parent Advisory Councils Meet

Frequency of Meetings	Number of Respondents	Percentages
Weekly	0	0.0
Twice A Month	3	6.1
Monthly	42	85.7
Other	4	8.2
Totals	49	100.0

Table 27

When Parent Advisory Councils Meet

Time of Meetings	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
During School Day	10	20.4
Evening	28	57.1
Combination	11	22.4
Totals	49	100.0

in the development of the agenda for the meetings. (There was one respondent who did not answer this question). Table 28 shows the responses along with corresponding percentages.

The participants were asked to indicate if their councils kept minutes of meetings. Forty-six respondents or 95.8 percent indicated that their councils kept minutes, while two respondents stated that minutes were not kept. (One respondent did not answer this question). The literature advised that councils keep an accurate record of meetings and all related activities. From the answers indicated by 95.8 percent of the respondents, it is clear that the practice of an overwhelming number of councils is consistent with this recommendation. Table 29 reports these data.

According to the data received, thirty-one respondents or 64.6 percent indicated that their councils arrived at decisions by simple majority. Simple majority refers to decisions being made by at least 50 percent of the council members. Maximum majority is a term which indicates that decisions are made by at least two-thirds or three-fourths of the council members. Only ten respondents or 20.8 percent stated that decisions were made by maximum majority. Only seven respondents or 14.6 percent indicated that decisions were made by unanimous decision. (One respondent did not answer the question). Table 30 shows these data.

Table 31 shows how the respondents answered the question concerning notices to parents and the community. Participants were asked to mark YES if their councils gave information to parents and

Table 28

Parent Advisory Council Participation In The
Development of the Agenda for Meetings

Responses to Agenda Participation	Number of Respondents	Relative Percentages	Adjusted Percentages
Yes	42	85.7	87.5
No	6	12.2	12.5
Missing	1	2.0	Missing
Totals	49	100.0	100.0

Table 29

Parent Advisory Council Keeping Minutes

Response to Keeping of Minutes	Number of Respondents	Relative Percentages	Adjusted Percentages
Yes	46	93.9	95.8
No	2	4.1	4.2
Missing	1	2.0	Missing
Totals	49	100.0	100.0

Table 30
How Decisions Are Made

Manner of Decision	Number of Respondents	Relative Percentages	Adjusted Percentages
Unanimous	7	14.3	14.6
Maximum Majority	10	20.3	20.8
Simple Majority	31	63.3	64.6
Missing Data	1	2.0	Missing
Totals	49	100.0	100.0

Table 31

Notification to Community
of PAC Meetings

Method of Notification	Percentage of Agreement
Notices by Radio	40.8
Notices By TV	32.7
Notices By Newspaper	65.3
Notices By School Publication	61.2
Notices By Memo	87.8
No Notification	4.1

N.B. Some notices were disseminated by more than one form of communication, and not all forms (TV for instance) for each meeting.

to the community by the methods listed. They were to check NO if their councils did not use the methods of notification listed. The notification method receiving the largest percentage of affirmative marks was notification by memo, with 87.8 percent. The next two methods, notification by newspaper and notification by school publication, received 65.3 percent and 61.2 percent of the affirmative marks respectively. Notification by radio received 40.8 percent affirmative marks and notification by television received 32.7 percent of the affirmative marks by the respondents. Only 4.1 percent of the respondents indicated that there was no notification to the parents and to the community by the council.

RANKINGS OF ROLES AND FUNCTIONS

The participants were asked to rank the roles and functions of parent advisory councils with respect to importance. The number one was considered the most important and all subsequent numbers were of lesser importance. There were four roles which were ranked by the forty-nine respondents. Table 32 shows the order of importance of the four roles, according to the respondents. The table also shows the number of respondents assigning ranks to each role along with corresponding percentages. The percentages next to each role indicate the percentage of the forty-nine respondents who ranked the particular role as first, second, third or fourth. The first role was that of advisory with 49.0 percent of respondents ranking this role as the most important. The second role was that of supporter, with forty-nine percent of all respondents ranking this

Table 32

Respondents' Perceptions of the Relative
Importance of Roles of the PAC
by Rank

Rank	Role	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Agreement Between Respondents
1	Advisor	24	49.0
2	Supporter	24	49.0
3	Director	25	51.0
4	Non-Supporter	46	95.0

role as the second most important. Fifty-one percent of all respondents agreed by ranking the role of director as third in importance. The role of non-director was ranked fourth and accounted for the largest agreement among respondents with ninety-four percent.

The data received from the respondents indicated that the primary and secondary roles of a parent advisory council in bilingual education was that of advisor and supporter respectively. This is in accordance with the review of literature which indicated that most advisory councils acted in an advisory capacity and supported the efforts of the school administration in the development and implementation of goals. The role of non-supporter received the largest number of concurring ranks by ninety-five of the respondents and indicates that this role of adversary to the program is the least desirable.

The participants were asked to rank the functions of a parent advisory council under three program areas. The first program area was planning, the second was implementation and the third was evaluation. Under planning there were six functions which were ranked. Seventy-nine percent of all the respondents agreed by ranking identification of needs as the most important function under planning. Development of objectives was considered the second most important function by sixty-nine percent of the respondents. Identification of needs and development of objectives were the primary and secondary functions under the program area of planning. This

indicated that the parent advisory council should be involved in the identification of needs with respect to bilingual education and, once those needs were identified, the involvement of the council in the development of objectives to meet those needs was desirable. Course selection was ranked third with twenty or 40.8 percent agreement on this function. Budget planning and textbook selection were ranked fourth and fifth respectively, followed by planning of school facilities as the sixth and last function. This indicates that the three groups surveyed did not perceive the planning of school facilities important for the advisory council. Table 33 shows the rankings of program area functions in planning.

The second set of five functions to be ranked by participants came under the general program heading of Implementation. The primary function of the parent advisory council, according to the three groups surveyed, was interpretation of the bilingual program to the community. Fifty-seven percent of the respondents concurred with this function being ranked first. The role of public relations was chosen as the second most important function by thirty percent of the respondents. With respect to the review of the literature, interpretation of the program was a recognized function for an advisory council. Closely related to the interpretation of the program was the function of public relations. The function of curriculum support was ranked third among six functions. Clearly this function was not thought of by the groups surveyed as primary or secondary in importance. The functions of inservice

Table 33

Respondents' Perceptions of Functions
in the Program Area of Planning
by Rank

Rank	Function	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Agreement Between Respondents
1	Identification of Needs	39	79.0
2	Development of Objectives	34	69.0
3	Course Selection	20	40.8
4	Budget Planning	14	28.6
5	Textbook Selection	25	51.0
6	Planning of School Facilities	24	49.0

training, teacher development and personnel policies were ranked fourth and fifth respectively with personnel policies having seventy-one percent agreement among the three groups. This indicates that the respondents felt that the advisory council should be more involved with interpretation of the program and with public relations and not so involved with administrative responsibilities such as inservice training and personnel policies. Table 34 indicates the distribution of the number of respondents and the corresponding percentages for functions ranked under Program Implementation.

Program Evaluation was the third area and included seven functions to be ranked by participants. Fifty-one percent of the respondents perceived that the primary function of the advisory council in this program area was evaluation of the program. Of the seven functions ranked in this area, evaluation of the program had the largest agreement among respondents. The second most important function in the area of evaluation was evaluation of objectives for curriculum. The ranking of evaluation of the program and evaluation of objectives for curriculum, first and second respectively, is in harmony with the identification of needs and development of objectives ranked first and second respectively in Planning, and interpretation of the bilingual program ranked first in Implementation. If the advisory councils are indeed involved in the development of objectives, then the councils should also be involved in the interpretation of the bilingual program to the community. The next

Table 34

Respondents' Perceptions of Functions
in the Program Area of Implementation
by Rank

Rank	Function	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Agreement Between Respondents
1	Interpretation of Program	28	57.0
2	Public Relations	15	30.0
3	Curriculum Support	16	32.0
4	Inservice Training	19	38.0
5	Personnel Policies	35	71.0

appropriate functions for the advisory council should then be an evaluation of the program and objectives for curriculum.

The function ranked third was the evaluation of the parent advisory council, followed by evaluation of the community. The three other functions, that of evaluation of students, teachers and administrators were ranked fifth, sixth and seventh respectively. It is evident from the data that the three groups surveyed perceived that evaluation of students, teachers and administrators is of lesser importance than evaluation of the overall program, objectives and the parent advisory council. Table 35 shows the data discussed, along with the number and percentage of agreement among respondents who ranked the particular function.

It was necessary to check the order or roles and functions ranked by importance by assigning a parametric population value to the non-parametric ranked value. The crosscheck was calculated by multiplying the number of respondents ranking each role by the value of each numeric rank. Rank values were assigned as follows: rank number one was equal to one point, rank number two was equal to two points, rank number three was equal to three points and rank number four was equal to four points. The reason for the 1.5, 2.5 and 3.5 ranks is that some respondents ranked some roles equally, which necessitated using the process of tied ranks when assigning values to roles. The process of tied ranks is used when the number of items ranked equally are added with respect to the rank number they might have been assigned. The total is then divided by

Table 35

Respondents' Perceptions of Functions
in the Program Area of
Evaluation by Rank

Rank	Function	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Agreement Between Respondents
1	Evaluation of Program	25	51.0
2	Evaluation of Objectives	13	26.0
3	Evaluation of PAC	11	22.0
4	Evaluation of Community	11	22.0
5	Evaluation of Students	15	30.0
6	Evaluation of Teachers	20	40.0
7	Evaluation of Administrators	17	34.0

the number of items which were equally ranked. The value from the division process is then assigned as the rank for each item. Tables 36, 37, 38 and 39 show the roles and functions under the three program areas of planning, implementation and evaluation, along with numeric totals for each. The numeric value at the end of each row corresponding to either a role or a function was calculated by multiplying the number of respondents ranking each role or function by the value assigned to each rank. The lower the numeric total associated with the specific role or function, the higher the ranking. For example, the role of advisor had a numeric total of 92.5 (the lowest numeric total of the four roles) which indicates the role of advisor is ranked number one, not only by having twenty-four respondents rank this role as number one, but by also having the lowest numeric total on the crosscheck. The results of the validations indicate that the rankings of roles and functions as first reported in Tables 32, 33, 34, and 35 were identical.

AGREEMENT ON THE RANKING OF ROLES AND FUNCTIONS

This section presents statistical data concerning the degree of agreement within each group of respondents on the rankings of roles and the functions in the three program areas of planning, implementation and evaluation. As previously stated in Chapter 3, the researcher utilized the Kendal Coefficient of Concordance W which provided ". . . an index of the divergence of the actual agreement shown in the data from the maximum possible (perfect) agreement."²

²Signey Siegel, *Nonparametric Statistics For The Behavioral Sciences* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956), p. 330.

Table 36

Validation of Respondents' Ranking of Each Role

Roles	Ranks								Assigned Numerical Totals
	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4		
Advisor	24	0	16	1	8	0	0	82.5	
Supporter	12	0	24	0	13	0	0	99.0	
Director	12	0	9	1	25	0	2	115.5	
Non-supporter	0	0	0	0	3	0	46	193.0	

N.B. The assigned numerical value for each role calculated by multiplying the number of respondents ranking each role by the rank. The lower the assigned numerical total, the higher the assigned rank.

Table 37

Validation of Respondents' Ranking of Each
Function in Planning

Roles	Ranks											Assigned Numerical Totals
	1.0	1.5	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	5.5	6.0	
Needs Identification	40	0	7	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	61.0
Objectives Development	4	0	34	0	4	1	3	0	2	0	1	155.5
Course Selection	0	0	1	0	20	1	17	1	5	1	3	186.5
Budget Planning	2	0	4	0	14	0	9	1	7	1	11	199.0
Text Selection	1	0	1	0	2	0	12	1	25	3	4	227.0
Facilities Planning	0	0	2	0	7	1	7	1	5	2	24	241.0

N.B. The assigned numerical value for each function was calculated by multiplying the number of respondents ranking each function by the rank. The lower the assigned numerical total, the higher the assigned rank.

Table 38

Validation of Respondents' Ranking of Each
Function in Implementation

Roles	Ranks									Assigned Numerical Totals
	1.0	1.5	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	
Program Interpretation	28	2	12	0	3	1	1	0	2	81.5
Public Relations	6	1	15	1	9	3	11	1	2	136.0
Curriculum Development	6	0	12	0	16	3	12	0	0	136.5
Inservice Training	4	1	6	1	11	1	19	0	6	162.5
Personnel Policies	2	0	1	0	4	2	4	1	35	218.5

N.B. The assigned numerical value for each function was calculated by multiplying the number of respondents ranking each function by the rank. The lower the assigned numerical total, the higher the assigned rank.

Table 39

Validation of Respondents' Ranking of Each
Function in Evaluation

Roles	Ranks														Assigned Numerical Totals
	0.5	1.0	1.5	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	5.5	6.0	6.5	7.0	
Evaluation of Program	0	25	1	8	0	4	2	6	2	1	0	0	0	0	99.5
Evaluation of Objections	0	5	0	13	0	11	2	4	2	5	1	3	0	3	165.5
Evaluation of PAC	0	7	1	11	0	6	0	10	1	3	0	6	0	4	172.0
Evaluation of Community	1	2	0	6	0	7	2	11	2	2	1	5	0	10	211.0
Evaluation of Students	0	5	0	4	0	5	2	2	2	15	1	8	0	5	215.5
Evaluation of Teachers	0	1	0	1	0	8	2	4	1	8	1	20	0	3	241.0
Evaluation of Adminis- trators	0	1	0	3	0	3	1	6	2	6	2	8	0	17	260.5

Testing the significance of the observed value of W was possible by ". . . determining the probability associated with the occurrence under H_0 of a value as large as the S with which it is associated."³ Siegel also states: "A high or significant value of W may be interpreted as meaning that the observers or judges are applying essentially the same standard in ranking the N objects under study."⁴

The value of W was calculated for each group of respondents for the ranking of roles as presented in the following results:

Agreement of the Rankings of the Roles

<u>Respondents</u>	<u>W Value</u>	<u>S Value</u>	<u>Significance (.05)</u>
Chairpersons	.51	502.0	yes
Principals	.70	793.5	yes
Project Directors	.79	1589.0	yes

All three S values associated with W were significant at the .05 level. Principals and project directors had W values which were considerably higher than the W value of chairpersons. The higher W values by principals and project directors may indicate that these two groups were more in agreement and were applying essentially the same standard when asked to rank roles for parent advisory councils. It is important to point out, however, that although principals and project directors had W values of .70 and .79 respectively, the S values associated with each W was found to be significant at the .05 level.

³ Ibid., p. 235.

⁴ Ibid., p. 237.

In the area of program planning, the three groups surveyed had S values associated with W values which were significant at the .05 level. In ranking the functions under program planning, the groups of chairpersons and principals had identical W values. Both S values associated with the chairpersons' W value of .50 and the principals' W value of .51 were significant. The project directors in the ranking of functions under program planning had a W value of .67 which was the highest of the three groups of respondents. The S value associated with the project directors' W was also significant at the .05 level. The following data present the data discussed:

Agreement of the Ranking of Functions In Program Planning

<u>Respondents</u>	<u>W Value</u>	<u>S Value</u>	<u>Significance (.05)</u>
Chairpersons	.51	1846.7	yes
Principals	.51	2140.2	yes
Project Directors	.67	5013.5	yes

The functions in implementation were also ranked by the three groups of respondents and each group had an S value associated with its respective W value which was significant at the .05 level. The W value for chairpersons was .38 and the W value for project directors was .37. The principals had a W value of .48 with a S value significant at the .05 level. The significance of each W value indicates that each group had agreement and were applying essentially the same standard when ranking the functions under the program area of implementation. The following data presents the

statistical results concerning the agreement within each group on functions ranked under program implementation:

Agreement of the Ranking of Functions In Implementation

<u>Respondents</u>	<u>W Value</u>	<u>S Value</u>	<u>Significance (.05)</u>
Chairpersons	.38	741.5	yes
Principals	.49	1096.0	yes
Project Directors	.37	1484.5	yes

The functions ranked under program area of evaluation by the respondents indicated that there was little agreement among chairpersons. Chairpersons had a W value of .17 and an associated S value which was not significant. These data indicate that chairpersons did not apply the same standard when ranking the functions under program evaluation. The W values of the principals and project directors were .42 and .22 respectively. The W values of .42 and .22 both had S values which were significant at the .05 level. Both groups of principals and project directors applied essentially the same standard when ranking the functions under the program area of evaluation. The following data present these results:

Agreement of the Ranking of Functions
In Evaluation

<u>Respondents</u>	<u>W Value</u>	<u>S Value</u>	<u>Significance (.05)</u>
Chairpersons	.17	909.6	no
Principals	.42	2629.0	yes
Project Directors	.22	2435.0	yes

DISCUSSION OF HYPOTHESES

For the purpose of presenting the following findings, the data were grouped and discussed under each of the six hypotheses. The

discussion will be based on the determination of significance between the group means in the ranking of roles and functions.

Hypothesis 1 The first hypothesis stated that there is no difference between the perception of principals, project directors and advisory council chairpersons in regard to roles and functions of the Parent Advisory Council.

This hypothesis focuses on the independent variable of position of participants and its effect on those roles which were identified for an advisory council: supporter, advisory, non-supporter and director. This hypothesis also focuses on those functions which were identified under the program areas of planning, implementation and evaluation. The functions under program planning were: textbook selection, course selection, budget planning, development of objectives, identification of needs, and planning of school facilities. The functions under implementation were: public relations, interpretation of program to community, curriculum support, personnel policies, and inservice training. The functions under evaluation were: evaluation of students, evaluation of teachers, evaluation of the program, evaluation of the parent advisory council, evaluation of administrators, evaluation of objectives and evaluation of community. The data for the first hypothesis are presented under four program area headings: roles, planning, implementation and evaluation.

Roles

<u>Position</u>	<u>Number of Cases</u>	<u>Wilk's Lambda</u>	<u>Degrees of Freedom</u>	<u>Significance (.05)</u>
Chairpersons	14			
Principals	15	.88	6	not sig.
Project Directors	20			

Planning

<u>Position</u>	<u>Number of Cases</u>	<u>Wilk's Lambda</u>	<u>Degrees of Freedom</u>	<u>Significance (.05)</u>
Chairpersons	14			
Principals	15	.72	10	not sig.
Project Directors	20			

Implementation

<u>Position</u>	<u>Number of Cases</u>	<u>Wilk's Lambda</u>	<u>Degrees of Freedom</u>	<u>Significance (.05)</u>
Chairpersons	14			
Principals	15	.89	8	not sig.
Project Directors	20			

Evaluation

<u>Position</u>	<u>Number of Cases</u>	<u>Wilk's Lambda</u>	<u>Degrees of Freedom</u>	<u>Significance (.05)</u>
Chairpersons	14			
Principals	15	.64	12	not sign.
Project Directors	20			

The Wilk's Lambda value for the three groups of participants ranking the roles and functions under three program areas was not significant at the .05 level. This leads to the conclusion that the difference between the perceptions of chairpersons, principals and project directors toward the roles and functions of the parent advisory

council is not statistically significant. The null hypothesis was accepted. (Refer to Chapter 3 for the process of transforming rank scores into normalized scores.)

Hypothesis 2 The second hypothesis stated that there is no difference in the perception between the groups of principals, project directors and advisory council chairpersons who are Spanish-English bilinguals from those principals, project directors and advisory council chairpersons who are not Spanish-English bilinguals in regard to the roles and functions of the Parent Advisory Council.

This hypothesis focuses on the independent variable of Spanish-English bilingualism and its effect on the ranking of the roles and functions identified under each program area. The data for the second hypothesis are presented under four program area headings: roles, planning, implementation and evaluation.

Roles

<u>Bilingualism</u>	<u>Number of Cases</u>	<u>Wilk's Lambda</u>	<u>Degrees of Freedom</u>	<u>Significance (.05)</u>
Bilingual	37	.99	3	not sig.
Not Bilingual	11			

Planning

<u>Bilingualism</u>	<u>Number of Cases</u>	<u>Wilk's Lambda</u>	<u>Degrees of Freedom</u>	<u>Significance (.05)</u>
Bilingual	37	.95	5	not sig.
Not Bilingual	11			

Implementation

<u>Bilingualism</u>	<u>Number of Cases</u>	<u>Wilk's Lambda</u>	<u>Degrees of Freedom</u>	<u>Significance (.05)</u>
Bilingual	37	.94	4	not sig.
Not Bilingual	11			

Evaluation

<u>Bilingualism</u>	<u>Number of Cases</u>	<u>Wilk's Lambda</u>	<u>Degrees of Freedom</u>	<u>Significance (.05)</u>
Bilingual	37	.92	6	not sig.
Not Bilingual	11			

The Wilk's Lambda value for the difference of the group means of participants who were Spanish-English Bilinguals in ranking the roles and functions under the three program areas was not significant at the .05 level. This leads to the conclusion that the difference between the perceptions of those participants who are and who are not Spanish-English bilinguals toward roles and functions of the Parent Advisory Council is not statistically significant. The null hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 3 The third hypothesis stated that there is no difference in the perception between the groups of principals, project directors and advisory council chairpersons of different age levels in regard to the roles and functions of the Parent Advisory Council.

This hypothesis focuses on the independent variable of age level and its effect on the ranking of roles and functions identified under each program area. The age levels were originally in four categories: 21-30, 31-40, 41-50 and 51 and over. In order to execute the appropriate statistics, it was necessary to expand the age levels as follows: 21-40 and 41 and over. The data for the third hypothesis are presented under four headings: roles, program planning, implementation and evaluation.

Roles

<u>Age Level</u>	<u>Number of Cases</u>	<u>Wilk's Lambda</u>	<u>Degrees of Freedom</u>	<u>Significance (.05)</u>
21-40	25	.93	3	not sig.
41 and over	24			

Planning

<u>Age Level</u>	<u>Number of Cases</u>	<u>Wilk's Lambda</u>	<u>Degrees of Freedom</u>	<u>Significance (.05)</u>
21-40	25	.81	5	not sig.
41 and over	24			

Implementation

<u>Age Level</u>	<u>Number of Cases</u>	<u>Wilk's Lambda</u>	<u>Degrees of Freedom</u>	<u>Significance (.05)</u>
21-40	25	.92	4	not sig.
41 and over	24			

Evaluation

<u>Age Level</u>	<u>Number of Cases</u>	<u>Wilk's Lambda</u>	<u>Degrees of Freedom</u>	<u>Significance (.05)</u>
21-40	25	.90	6	not sig.
41 and over	24			

The Wilk's Lambda value for the difference of the group means of participants in the two age levels in ranking the roles and functions under the three program areas was not significant at the .05 level. The conclusion is that the difference between the perceptions of those participants in the 21-40 age level and those in the 41 and over age level toward roles and functions of the Parent Advisory Council is not statistically significant. The null hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 4 The fourth hypothesis stated that there is no difference in the perception between the group of principals, project directors and advisory council chairpersons who are of the same ethnicity as the advisory council from those principals, project directors and advisory council chairpersons who are not of the same ethnicity as the advisory council in regard to the roles and functions of the Parent Advisory Council.

This hypothesis focuses on the independent variable of ethnicity and its effect on the ranking of roles and functions identified under each program. The data concerning the fourth hypothesis are shown under four headings: roles, planning, implementation and evaluation.

Roles

<u>Ethnicity</u>	<u>Number of Cases</u>	<u>Wilk's Lambda</u>	<u>Degrees of Freedom</u>	<u>Significance (.05)</u>
Same Ethnicity	31			
Different Ethnicity	18	.96	3	not sig.

Planning

<u>Ethnicity</u>	<u>Number of Cases</u>	<u>Wilk's Lambda</u>	<u>Degrees of Freedom</u>	<u>Significance (.05)</u>
Same Ethnicity	31			
Different Ethnicity	18	.99	5	not sig.

Implementation

<u>Ethnicity</u>	<u>Number of Cases</u>	<u>Wilk's Lambda</u>	<u>Degrees of Freedom</u>	<u>Significance (.05)</u>
Same Ethnicity	31			
Different Ethnicity	18	.95	4	not sig.

Evaluation

<u>Ethnicity</u>	<u>Number of Cases</u>	<u>Wilk's Lambda</u>	<u>Degrees of Freedom</u>	<u>Significance (.05)</u>
Same Ethnicity	31			
Different Ethnicity	18	.92	6	not sig.

The Wilk's Lambda value for the difference of the group means of those participants who are and those participants who are not of the same ethnicity as the advisory council in ranking the roles and functions under the three program areas were not significant at the .05 level. From this it may be concluded that the difference between the perception of those participants of the same ethnicity as the council and those of different ethnicity from the council is not statistically significant in regard to the ranking of roles and functions of the Parent Advisory Council. The null hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 5 The fifth hypothesis stated that there is no difference between the groups of principals, project directors and advisory council chairpersons possessing different level of education in regard to the roles and functions of the Parent Advisory Council.

This hypothesis focuses on the independent variable of education level and its effect on the ranking of roles and functions identified under each program. The data for the fifth hypothesis are presented under four headings: roles, planning, implementation and evaluation.

Roles

<u>Education Level</u>	<u>Number of Cases</u>	<u>Wilk's Lambda</u>	<u>Degrees of Freedom</u>	<u>Significance (.05)</u>
K-H.S. Diploma	5			
Some Coll./BA/BS	8	.87	6	not sig.
M.A./M.S. Ph.D./Ed.D.	36			

Planning

<u>Education Level</u>	<u>Number of Cases</u>	<u>Wilk's Lambda</u>	<u>Degrees of Freedom</u>	<u>Significance (.05)</u>
K-H.S. Diploma	5			
Some Coll./BA/BS	8	.72	10	not sig.
M.A./M.S. Ph.D./Ed.D.	36			

Implementation

<u>Education Level</u>	<u>Number of Cases</u>	<u>Wilk's Lambda</u>	<u>Degrees of Freedom</u>	<u>Significance (.05)</u>
K-H.S. Diploma	5			
Some Coll./BA/BS	8	.84	8	not sig.
M.A./M.S. Ph.D./Ed.D.	36			

Evaluation

<u>Education Level</u>	<u>Number of Cases</u>	<u>Wilk's Lambda</u>	<u>Degrees of Freedom</u>	<u>Significance (.05)</u>
K-H.S. Diploma	5			
Some Coll./BA/BS	8	.69	12	not sig.
M.A./M.S. Ph.D./Ed.D.	36			

The Wilk's Lambda value for the difference of the group means of participants in the three levels of education in regard to the ranking of roles and functions under the three program areas was not significant at the .05 level. It may be concluded that the difference between the perceptions of those participants in the Kindergarten-H.S.

Diploma level, Some College-B.A./B.S. level and M.A./M.S.-Ph.D./Ed.D. level is not statistically significant. The null hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 6 The sixth hypothesis stated that there is no difference in the perception between the group of female principals, female project directors and female advisory council chairpersons from the group of male principals, male project directors and male advisory council chairpersons in regard to the roles and functions of the Parent Advisory Council.

This hypothesis focuses on the independent variable of sex and its effect on the ranking by the participants of roles and functions under each program area. The data for the sixth hypothesis are presented under four headings: roles, planning, implementation and evaluation.

Roles

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Number of Cases</u>	<u>Wilk's Lambda</u>	<u>Degrees of Freedom</u>	<u>Significance (.05)</u>
Males	31	.80	3	sig.
Females	18			

Planning

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Number of Cases</u>	<u>Wilk's Lambda</u>	<u>Degrees of Freedom</u>	<u>Significance (.05)</u>
Males	31	.83	5	not sig.
Females	18			

Implementation

<u>Sex</u>	<u>Number of Cases</u>	<u>Wilk's Lambda</u>	<u>Degrees of Freedom</u>	<u>Significance (.05)</u>
Males	31	.89	4	not sig.
Females	18			

Evaluation				
<u>Sex</u>	<u>Number of Cases</u>	<u>Wilk's Lambda</u>	<u>Degrees of Freedom</u>	<u>Significance (.05)</u>
Males	31	.88	6	not sig.
Females	18			

The Wilk's Lambda value for the difference of the group means of male participants and female participants in the ranking of roles was significant at the .05 level. The Wilk's Lambda values for the difference of the group means of male participants and female participants in the ranking of functions under the three program areas were not significant at the .05 level. This leads to the conclusion that there is in fact a statistically significant difference between the perceptions of male and female participants in the ranking of roles, but there is not a statistically significant difference in the perception of male and female participants in the ranking of functions under each program area. It may be stated that part of the null hypothesis referring to functions is accepted, but that the part of the null hypothesis referring to roles is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis accepted.

It is important to examine where the differences in perception are between male and female participants in the ranking of roles of parent advisory councils. The data which follow present the four roles, male and female columns with their respective rankings on the particular role.

Difference In Ranks According To Sex

<u>Role</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Supporter	2	1
Advisor	1	3
Director	3	2
Non-Supporter	4	4

In the order of importance, male participants ranked the role of advisor first, supporter second, director third and non-supporter fourth. This is where there is a major difference with respect to female participants. They ranked the role of supporter first, director second, advisor third and agreed with the male participants on the non-supporter role by ranking it fourth. It may be concluded that males perceive the primary and secondary roles to be supporter and advisor respectively. The female participants, on the other hand, perceive the primary role to be that of supporter and feel strongly about the council directing by ranking the role of director as second in importance.

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

This chapter presented demographic data on the organization and composition of the councils represented by the chairpersons, principals and project directors. Information was also presented on the processing of the data, interpretation of results and the examination of the six hypotheses.

The results of the Kendall Coefficient of Concordance W indicated that in all but one test there was agreement on roles and

functions by each group of participants which was statistically significant at the .05 level. The only Concordance test which showed no statistical significance was the degree of agreement of chairpersons on the ranking of functions under the program area of evaluation.

There were five hypotheses in which it was found that no significant statistical differences existed between the perceptions of the groups identified by the position of the participants: age level, education level, bilingualism and ethnicity. In each instance, however, the variable of sex, identified in Hypothesis 6, did make a significant difference in the ranking of roles for the parent advisory council. Sex did not, however, make a significant difference in the ranking of the functions under each of the program areas previously identified. Thus Null Hypothesis 6 was, in part, rejected because of the variable sex on the ranking of functions in the planning, implementation and evaluation.

The results of the study seem to support the role of advisor as the primary role for the parent advisory council in bilingual education projects as defined by the literature and examined through the hypotheses. The results of the study overwhelmingly support the primary functions of the identification of needs, development of objectives, interpretation of program to the community, public relations, evaluation of the program and evaluation of the objectives, which were all defined in the literature as appropriate functions for parent advisory councils.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND OBSERVATIONS

The review of the literature indicated that there is increasing evidence that advisory councils operate more efficiently when roles and functions are specified by school officials. From the literature, it was evident that roles and functions of parent advisory councils serving bilingual education projects funded under ESEA Title VII have not been adequately specified. Thus, the study focused on identifying and defining roles was undertaken. This chapter reviews the procedures utilized, presents the demographic data concerning parent advisory councils, the ranking of roles and functions, and the differences of perceptions between the respondents with respect to the variables: sex, age level, education level, position of respondent, bilingualism and ethnicity. Also presented are the positive and negative findings concerning parent advisory councils and the varying conditions within which they operate. Recommendations for further study are presented as well as a section including observations regarding bilingual education in general.

SUMMARY

This study was based on the assumption that there would be no significant differences between the perceptions of respondents

with respect to identified variables, on the ranking of roles and functions of parent advisory councils serving Spanish-English bilingual projects funded under ESEA Title VII. After an extensive review of literature, four roles were identified: advisor, supporter, director and non-supporter. Through the literature the three program areas of planning, evaluation and implementation and their functions were identified. The role and function descriptors were incorporated into a questionnaire where participants were asked to rank roles and functions according to primacy. Along with ranking roles and functions, participants from twenty-one bilingual projects were also asked to answer questions concerning the organizational format, procedures and composition of the advisory councils they represented.

The sample was made up of twenty-one participants from each group of: chairpersons, principals and project directors. Responses were received from fourteen (67 percent) of the chairpersons, fifteen (71 percent) of the principals and twenty (95 percent) of the project directors. The forty-nine responses represented 77 percent of the sample.

The demographic data were analyzed by the Kendall Coefficient of Concordance W and the Subprogram Discriminant Analysis from the Statistical Package For The Social Sciences. The .05 level of significance was chosen for measurement of statistical significance in both tests.

This study revealed that parent advisory councils serving Spanish-English bilingual projects are similar to advisory councils described by the literature, with respect to: organizational format of councils, method of choosing chairpersons, time, place and frequency of meetings, term of membership, and method of making decision. The majority of councils represented had organizational formats with rules that were either written or understood. Chairpersons were generally elected by the council. The majority of councils have meetings in the schools, once a month and in the evenings when the rate of attendance is higher. A one-year term of membership is specified in 65.3 percent of the responses. The method of making decisions by simple majority (51 percent) was the most prevalent.

Major differences related to mechanics of organization in councils as indicated in the literature were: how general membership is chosen and the number of members on a council. The literature indicated that general membership on councils is most often attained by an election, however, in the councils surveyed in this study, general membership was most often achieved by volunteering one's services. The councils represented were comprised of ten to fifteen or more than twenty members, which differs slightly from the recommended number of fifteen to twenty members.

It was evident from the data analyzed that there existed significant agreement within each group of chairpersons, principals and project directors in regard to the ranking by importance of the

roles and functions of parent advisory councils. There was only one instance where there was no significant agreement; the chairpersons had very little agreement on the ranking of functions under the area of program planning.

The analysis of the data indicated that the role of advisor was ranked first, followed by the roles of supporter, director and non-supporter, in that sequence. Identification of needs and development of objectives were ranked first and second respectively in the program area of planning. Under implementation, interpretation of program and public relations were also ranked first and second respectively. Under the third area of program evaluation, the respondents ranked evaluation of the bilingual program first and evaluation of its objectives second.

The six null hypotheses tested and the results were as follows:

Hypothesis One stated:

There is no difference in the perception between the groups of principals, project directors and advisory council chairpersons in regard to their perceptions of roles and functions of the Parent Advisory Council.

Because of lack of significance the null hypothesis was accepted, thus supporting the assumption that the positions of respondents does not make a difference in the ranking of roles and functions.

Hypothesis Two stated:

There is no difference in the perception between the group of principals, project directors and advisory council chairpersons who are Spanish-English bilinguals

from those principals, project directors and advisory council chairpersons who are not Spanish-English bilinguals in regard to their perceptions of roles and functions of the Parent Advisory Council.

The null hypothesis was accepted, lending support to the proposition that being or not being a Spanish-English bilingual makes no difference in regard to ranking roles and functions.

Hypothesis Three stated:

There is no difference in the perception between the groups of principals, project directors and chairpersons of different age levels in regard to their perceptions of roles and functions of the Parent Advisory Council.

The null hypothesis was accepted, thus supporting the assumption that the variable identified as age level makes no difference in the ranking of roles and functions.

Hypothesis Four stated:

There is no difference in the perception between the group of principals, project directors and advisory council chairpersons who are of the same ethnicity as the advisory council from those principals, project directors and advisory council chairpersons who are not of the same ethnicity as the advisory council in regard to their perceptions of roles and functions of the Parent Advisory Council.

This null hypothesis was also accepted, which supports the contention that ethnicity makes no difference in regard to the ranking of roles and functions by the respondents.

Hypothesis Five stated:

There is no difference in the perception between the groups of principals, project directors and advisory council chairpersons possessing different levels of education in regard to the roles and functions of the Parent Advisory Council.

The null hypothesis was accepted, which supports the researcher's assumption that different levels of education make no difference in the ranking of roles and functions.

Hypothesis Six stated:

There is no difference in the perception between the group of female principals, female project directors and female advisory council chairpersons from male principals, male project directors and male advisory council chairpersons in regard to the roles and functions of the Parent Advisory Council.

The null hypothesis was in part accepted. The study supports the assumption that the variable sex makes no difference in the ranking of functions. The variable sex did, however, make a difference in the ranking of roles, which necessitates this part of the null hypothesis to be rejected.

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions were developed after the demographic data on participants and councils, ranking of roles and functions, and differences of perceptions on identified variables were analyzed and discussed.

1. Parent advisory councils in bilingual projects utilize the democratic process which is indicated by the large percentage of respondents who stated that chairpersons are elected by the council.

2. The general membership, made up primarily of volunteers suggests a positive objective or necessity in bilingual projects to include as many parents as are willing to participate on the

council and not limit the general membership by an election.

3. A large majority, 77.1 percent of the respondents, were Spanish-English bilinguals. This large percentage could be highly significant and important, because of the fact that many, if not most, dealings with the community represented by the council are probably conducted in Spanish a majority of the time.

4. The advisory councils serving bilingual projects are well organized when consideration is given to the fact that a large majority of councils have rules, participate in the development of agenda, keep minutes of meetings, meet once a month and notify the parents and community of decisions and activities of the council.

The following conclusions are based on several activities or situations which are probably not desirable and might have a negative effect on bilingual programs.

5. Over one-third of the respondents indicated that the board of education or superintendent had not developed a formal plan or statement giving recognition to the council.

6. Over half of the respondents stated that limits of authority were not specified by either the board of education or the superintendent.

It is not known why most of the councils represented did not have the formal recognition of the board or superintendent. There is obviously a grey area over where authority, the locally constituted school board, or the federally mandated council has

jurisdiction over certain aspects of the bilingual program. It might seem a courtesy to recognize a council. With respect to limits of authority, an advisory council needs to be cognizant of what it can do and also know the acceptable procedures for successful accomplishment of duties. The literature was explicit in regard to the limits of authority by emphasizing that councils were more efficient when limits were specified.

The instances of non-compliance by some councils not having at least half of the membership comprised of parents with children enrolled in the bilingual program was very small, with only 6.1 percent of the respondents indicating this to be the situation. The instances of non-compliance by some councils not existing prior to the preparation of the proposal submitted to the Office of Bilingual Education, was unusually high, with 34.1 percent of the respondents indicating this to be the case. This leads to the conclusion that some communities do not systematically consult with parents in initial planning of the bilingual project.

The following conclusions relate to the ranking of roles and functions by the respondents.

7. The roles of advisor and supporter were ranked first and second respectively which indicated that respondents believe councils should advise school officials in designated areas, and lend support to school officials in arriving at program goals.

8. The functions ranked either first or second under the program areas of planning, implementation and evaluation were: identification of needs, development of objectives, interpretation

of the program of the community, public relations, evaluation of the program and evaluation of objectives.

These functions which were ranked as primary or secondary functions lend support to the literature reviewed which advocates these to be proper and expected functions of advisory councils.

The variables identified in the six hypotheses made no difference in the rankings of roles and functions, with the exception of the variable sex on the ranking of roles. This significant result in the study leads to several questions. Why does sex make a difference on the ranking of roles? Is the variable sex unrelated to the variables of Spanish-English bilingualism and ethnicity which were identified because of the genre of the study? If other researchers were to replicate the study in bilingual projects of different languages and also in some projects not federally funded, would they find the same pattern? Can the conclusion be that the difference on the ranking of roles is based on the biological make up of individuals as opposed to the cultural background?

The researcher does not attempt to answer these questions, but had an obligation to identify possible avenues of investigation which might answer why the variable sex made a difference on the ranking of roles. In the following section, several recommendations are presented which direct the formulation of research studies which might address some of the unanswered questions.

In arriving at the preceding conclusions no attempts were made to identify respondents or bilingual projects. The conclusions

drawn from this research study may be generalized only to Spanish-English bilingual projects with grades Kindergarten through eighth, funded under ESEA Title VII.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

It is recommended that:

1. A similar study be conducted involving chairpersons, principals and project directors from bilingual education projects in a secondary school setting.

2. A study should be conducted on the nature of the difference between the perceptions that female and male participants have of the roles of parent advisory councils in bilingual education projects.

3. A study be conducted dealing with the relationship of parent advisory councils with respect to local authority figures such as superintendents, board of education members and local government officials.

4. A study should be conducted to identify the perceptions held by parent advisory councils on the federal program for bilingual education (and other federal education programs).

5. A study concerned with the efficiency in fulfilling roles and executing functions of parent advisory councils serving bilingual projects should be undertaken.

6. A study investigating the benefits of having parent advisory councils with respect to academic achievements and social adjustment of students should be examined through the school and ethnic communities.

OBSERVATIONS

The researcher takes this opportunity to reflect on the study and possible implications. The review of literature revealed a long series of acts and amendments throughout the United States history promoting civil rights of individuals. The series of acts and amendments promoting rights of individuals culminated in major legislation when Congress passed The Civil Rights Act of 1964. This Act had great implications for many different minorities. With respect to education, this Act ". . . authorized the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public education."¹ The Act also prohibited "discrimination in federally assisted programs."² There was now federal legislation which attempted to insure the rights of all individuals. After the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, there came a series of acts and programs which were aimed at assisting minorities. Linguistic minorities were, of course, just one type of minority affected by The Civil Rights Act of 1964 and by the categorical programs that followed. The Bilingual Act of 1968 was the first act which was aimed at assisting linguistic minorities in public education. The Bilingual Act could not reach all ethnic backgrounds and thus came

¹Civil Rights Act of 1964, Pub. L. 88-352, 88th Cong., 1st Sess., H.R. 715, (1964).

²Ibid.

the Ethnic Heritage Program in 1972.³ The Ethnic Heritage Program was passed in recognition of those ethnic minorities such as Poles, Swedes and Germans who did not have a linguistic problem, but who did have the desire to promote an understanding of their history, culture and traditions which in part contributed to American culture. This study, of course, did not address itself to other federal programs aimed at assisting other than linguistic minorities; nor did this study address itself at the private schools with bilingual programs which receive no federal money. The study focused on Spanish-English bilingual education projects funded under ESEA Title VII.

The passage of ESEA was intended to reduce poverty by the development of federally funded education programs. There are other programs in ESEA besides Title VII in which linguistic minorities can participate. It would seem appropriate for a study to take place which would investigate the achievements of linguistic minorities from program to program and compare, if possible, overall benefits of each program. There may be the possibility that the bilingual program has not achieved all the goals originally intended, but what would the status be of linguistic minorities had there been no bilingual program at all? This question is difficult, if not impossible, to answer. There is, however, a bilingual program in the United States with a mandated parent advisory council in each federally funded project.

³House Committee On Education And Labor and the Senate Committee On Labor and Public Welfare, A Compilation of Federal Education Laws (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975), p. 148.

The purpose of the study was to identify roles and functions of advisory councils and to have advisory council chairpersons, principals and project directors rank these roles and functions according to their perceptions with respect to bilingual projects. Identifying the roles and functions of parent advisory councils serving Spanish-English bilingual projects funded under ESEA Title VII is the first study of this type according to the extensive review of literature conducted by the researcher. The study revealed that the roles and functions identified in the literature do exist in bilingual projects. The relationship between the school boards and the parent advisory councils is new and at times there does appear to be confusion with respect to what councils should do. There are some school boards and superintendents which have not recognized or specified the limits within which these councils may operate. Councils not knowing their limits of authority have difficulty in fulfilling roles and executing functions. The respondents in this study have indicated, through their perceptions, that parent advisory councils in bilingual education should fulfill specified roles and functions. These roles and functions should be allowed to be undertaken by parent advisory councils in bilingual projects. These parent advisory councils should not, however, operate unchecked. They should be evaluated by several measurements: first to evaluate if the educational standards of linguistic minority children are on an equal basis with other children; and, secondly, to evaluate the operation of the council and involvement of parents. It

is imperative to point out that before councils are evaluated the researcher feels that a complete program to familiarize the council members with their responsibilities be initiated, that roles and functions be specified, that goals and objectives for the councils be developed. Only then can objective evaluations of parent advisory councils take place.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- AASA. The Federal Government and Public Schools. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1965.
- Antieau, Chester J. Federal Civil Rights, Civil Practice. Rochester, N.Y.: The Lawyer's Cooperative Publishing Company, 1971.
- Ary, Donald, Lucy C. Jacobs, and Asghar Razavich. Introduction to Research in Education. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1972.
- Bailey, Stephen K., and Edith K. Mosher. ESEA The Office of Education Administers A Law. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1968.
- Berridge, Robert I. The Community Education Handbook. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1973.
- Brembeck, Cole S., and Walker H. Hill. Cultural Challenge To Education. Lexington: D.G. Heath and Company, 1973.
- Brophy, William A., and others. The Indian. Norman, Oklahoma: The University of Oklahoma Press, 1972.
- Cwik, Peter J., Marilyn J. King, and Curtis Van Voorhees. The Community Advisory Council. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, 1975.
- Davies, Don. Schools Where Parents Make A Difference. Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, 1976.
- Dixon, Wilfrid J., and Frank J. Massey, Jr. Introduction To Statistical Analysis. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969.
- Ferguson, George A. Statistical Analysis In Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1976.
- Glazer, Nathan, and Daniel P. Moynihan. Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish of New York. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1970.

- Gonder, Peggy Odell. Linking Schools and the Community. Arlington, Va.: National School Public Relations Association, 1977.
- Guilford, J.P. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.
- Hamlin, Herbert M. Citizens' Committees in the Public School. Danville, Ill.: Interstate Printing Company, 1952.
- John, Vera P., and Vivian M. Horner. Early Childhood Bilingual Education. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1971.
- Kindred, Leslie. School Public Relations. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957.
- Lapote, Carol. Some Effects of Parent and Community Participation on Public Education. New York: Columbia University, 1969.
- Marlow, Frank M. Putting Citizen Advisory Committees to Work in Your School. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.
- McGrath, J. H. Research Methods and Designs for Education. Scranton, Pa.: International Textbook Company, 1970.
- Moynihan, Daniel P. Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding. New York: The Free Press, 1969.
- Nie, Norman H., and others. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company, 1975.
- Oldham, Neild B. Citizens Advisory Committees: Public Participation Increases: Guides Change in American Education. Arlington, Va.: National School Public Relations Association, 1973.
- Sharpes, Donald K. "The Evolution of Federal Education Legislation," Education and the Federal Government. Unpublished Manuscript, 1978.
- Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics For The Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.
- Sumption, Merle R., and Yvonne Engstrom. School-Community Relations: A New Approach. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966.
- Ulibarri, Horacio. Bilingual Education: A Handbook for Educators. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1970.

Weinberg, Meyer, ed. A Chance to Learn. Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Weinstein, Shelly, and Douglas E. Mitchell, eds. Public Testimony on Public Schools by National Committee for Citizens in Education. Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchen Publishing Corporation, 1975.

B. PERIODICALS

Davies, Don. "Making Citizen Participation Work," National Elementary School Principal. March/April, 1976.

Davies, Don, Miriam Clasby, and Brian Powers. "The Plight of Citizens," Compact, Autumn, 1977.

Davies, Don. "Citizen participation in schools: a network of illusions," Citizen Action in Education, V, No. 1 (January, 1978).

Carpenter, C. C. "Principal Leadership and Parent Advisory Groups," Phi Delta Kappan, February, 1975.

Clasby, Miriam. "The Community Voice In Public Education," Social Policy, November/December, 1977.

Cronin, Thomas E., and Norman C. Thomas. "Federal Advisory Processes: Advice and Discontent," Science, CLXXI (February, 1971).

Fantini, Mario. "Community, Participation: Many Faces, Many Directions," Educational Leadership, XXIX (1972).

Greenwood, Gordon, William F. Breivogel, and Robert E. Jester. "Citizen Advisory Committees," Theory Into Practice, XVI, No. 1 (February, 1977).

Hereford, Karl T. "Citizens Committees for Public Schools," Bulletin of the Bureau of School Service, XXXII, No. 1 University of Kentucky, 1954.

Pena, Albar A. "Special Feature on Bilingual Education: An Overview," Today's Education, January/February, 1975.

"The Three R's in 70 Tongues," Time, February 13, 1978.

C. REPORTS/GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

- Andersson, Theodore, and Mildred Boyer. Bilingual Schooling in the United States. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970.
- Dickenson, William B., ed. "Health, Education and Welfare," Congress and the Nation. II, 1965-68. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Service, 1969.
- Civil Rights Act of 1964, Pub. L. 88-352, 88th Cong., 1st Sess., H.R. 715, 1964.
- Education Service Center, Region XII. Guide to Title VII ESEA Bilingual-Bicultural Programs 1976-1977. Austin, Texas: Dissemination and Assessment Center for Bilingual Education, 1977.
- Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967, Statutes at Large 81. 1968.
- Fusco, Gene C. Citizens Committees for Better Schools. Washington, D.C.: United States Office of Education, 1964.
- Higgins, William, comp. "Community Education," An Unscreened Computer Compilation. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1977.
- Higgins, William, comp. "Dissertation-Bilingual Education," An Unscreened Computer Compilation. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1977.
- Jayson, Lester S., ed. The Constitution of the United States of America. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.
- Mogulof, Melvin B. Citizen Participation: A Review on Federal Policies and Practices. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, 1970.
- Poynter, Henrietta, and Nelson Poynter, eds. Congressional Quarterly Almanac. 88th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1964, XX. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Service, 1965.
- Poynter, Henriette, and Nelson Poynter, eds. Congressional Quarterly Almanac. XII, 1965. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Service, 1966.

- Sanger, George P., ed. Statutes at Large and Proclamations of the United States of America. XVI. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1873.
- Stencel, Barbara. Bilingual Education. II, No. 7 Editorial Research Reports. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly, 1977.
- Sumner, Gerald C., and others. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change. Vol. III. The Process of Change. Santa Monica, Ca.: The Rand Corporation, 1975.
- National Advisory Council on Bilingual Education. Annual Report National Advisory Council on Bilingual Education. Washington, D.C.: J.A. Reyes Associates, Inc., 1975.
- National Advisory Council on Bilingual Education Second Annual Report. Washington, D.C.: InterAmerican Research Associates, 1976.
- National Advisory Council on Bilingual Education Third Annual Report. Washington, D.C.: InterAmerican Research Associates, 1977.
- United States Code Congressional and Administrative News. 88th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1964, I. St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Company, 1965.
- United States Code Congressional and Administrative News. 88th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1964, II. St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Company, 1965.
- United States Code Congressional and Administrative News. 90th Cong., 1st Sess., 1967, II. St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Company, 1967.
- United States Code Congressional and Administrative News. 90th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1967, I. St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Company, 1968.
- United States Code Congressional and Administrative News. 90th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1974, I. St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Company, 1975.
- United States Office of Education. "Criteria for Governing Grants," Federal Register, Friday, June 11, 1976.
- United States Office of Education. Manual for Project Applicants and Grantees. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1971.

- U. S. Congress. House. Hearings Before the General Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. 93rd Cong., 2nd Sess., Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974.
- U.S. Congress. Senate. A Bill to Amend the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965. Pub. L. 89-10, 90th Cong., 1st Sess., January 17, 1967.
- U.S. Congress. Senate. Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1967. S. Rept. 726 to Accompany H.R. 7819, 90th Cong., 1st Sess., 1967.

DISSERTATIONS

- Caldwell, T.P. "An Assessment of Arizona Community School Administrators Concerning School-Community Advisory Councils in Educational Decision-Making," Unpublished PhD dissertation, The University of Michigan, 1974.
- Linscomb, J.P. "The Structure and organization of Successful Community Advisory Councils in an Inner-City Area of Los Angeles City Unified School District," Unpublished PhD dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1972.
- Pumphrey, W.S. "The Structure and Organization of Successful Community Advisory Councils in an Emerging Middle-Class Area in the Los Angeles City School Districts," Unpublished PhD dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1971.
- Schneider, Susan G. "The 1974 Bilingual Education Amendments: Revolution, Reaction Or Reform," Published PhD dissertation, The University of Maryland, 1976.
- Tisdale, Grace K. "A Survey of Organization Patterns of School Community Advisory Groups in the Elementary Schools of the Los Angeles Unified School District," Unpublished EdD dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1971.
- Woons, G. J. "The Community School Council: Functions, Characteristics, And Issues," Unpublished PhD dissertation, Michigan State University, 1972.

APPENDIX A
QUESTIONNAIRE

QUESTIONNAIRE ON PARENT ADVISORY COUNCILS

SECTION I

Instructions: Items 1 through 26 are information items that will assist me organize and categorize your responses. Please answer ALL questions or statements by filling in or checking the appropriate answers.

1. What is your sex?

male
 female

2. What is your age?

under 20
 21-30
 31-40
 41-50
 51 and over

3. What is your highest level of education?

<input type="checkbox"/> K-6	<input type="checkbox"/> some years of college
<input type="checkbox"/> 7-9	<input type="checkbox"/> BA/BS
<input type="checkbox"/> 10-12	<input type="checkbox"/> MA/MS
<input type="checkbox"/> High School Diploma	<input type="checkbox"/> PhD/EdD

4. What is your ethnic background?

Mexican-American
 Puerto Rican
 Cuban-American
 Other (Please state) _____

5. Are you a Spanish-English bilingual?

yes
 no

6. Check your appropriate POSITION (S).

Parent Advisory Council Chairperson
 Parent Advisory Council member
 Principal
 Project Director

7. What is the majority ethnic background of the advisory council?

Mexican-American
 Puerto Rican
 Cuban American
 Other (Please state) _____

8. How was the chairperson chosen?
 Elected by the council
 Appointed by the principal or project director
 Appointed by community organization
 Other (Explain) _____
9. How is general membership on the advisory council attained?
 Election
 Appointment
 Volunteer
 Other (Explain) _____
10. How many members are on your advisory council?
 less than 3
 3-5
 6-9
 10-15
 16-20
 more than 20
11. What is the term of membership on your advisory council?
 1 year term
 2 year term
 3 year term or more
12. How many males are on your advisory council?
 none
 less than half
 half
 more than half
 all
13. Are at least 50% of the council members parents with children in the bilingual program?
 yes
 no
14. How long was the orientation program to explain the roles and functions of the parent advisory council?
 less than $\frac{1}{2}$ day
 $\frac{1}{2}$ day
 all day
 more than 1 day
 none
15. Is there a formal plan or statement by the board of education or the superintendent recognizing the parent advisory council?
 yes
 no

16. Has the board of education or superintendent specified the limits of authority of the parent advisory council?
 yes
 no
17. Was there a parent advisory council that existed prior to the bilingual education program?
 yes
 no
18. Was the parent advisory council on bilingual education formed prior to the preparation of the proposal submitted to the Office of Bilingual Education?
 Yes
 no
19. How does your parent advisory council function?
 Formal with unwritten rules
 Formal with written rules
 Informal but understood rules
 Informal with no rules
20. Where does the parent advisory council meet?
 In the school
 In community center
 In homes
 rotating
21. How often does your parent advisory council meet?
 Weekly
 Twice a month
 Monthly
 Other (Please explain) _____
22. When are the meetings held?
 During the school day (before 5 p.m.)
 Evening
 Combination of both
23. Does your parent advisory council participate in the development of the agenda for the meetings?
 yes
 no
24. Does your parent advisory council keep minutes of each meeting?
 yes
 no
25. How are the decisions made by the parent advisory council?
 Unanimous consent
 Maximum majority
 Simple majority

26. How does your parent advisory council issue notices to the public?
- _____ Radio
 - _____ TV
 - _____ Newspaper
 - _____ School publications
 - _____ Memo to parents
 - _____ No notification

SECTION II

Instructions: The four items represent possible roles of advisory councils. Rank each role by marking either the number 1, 2, 3, or 4 in the space provided next to the role. Number 1 would be the most important role; number 2 the second important role; number 3 the third important role and number 4 would be the least important role.

Roles of Parent Advisory Councils in Bilingual Education

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| _____ Supporter | - Interprets the program to the community and gives support to the goals and objectives developed by school officials. |
| _____ Advisor | - Assists school officials by making recommendations concerning the total bilingual program. |
| _____ non-supporter | - Reacts against program and does not give support to school officials. |
| _____ Director | - Has an influential role in the formulation of policy and actively solicits community support for or against proposed and existing policies. |

SECTION III

Instructions: The following items represent possible functions of parent advisory councils. Rank each function by marking 1, 2, 3, 4, etc. next to the function, until ALL functions under each program area are ranked. Number 1 would be the most important function, all subsequent numbers would be of lesser importance.

Program Planning For Bilingual Education

- _____ Textbook Selection
- _____ Course Selection or Content
- _____ Budget Planning
- _____ Development of Objectives
- _____ Identification of Needs
- _____ Planning of School Facilities

Program Implementation For Bilingual Education

- _____ Identifying Community Resources and Public Relations
- _____ Interpretation of Bilingual Program to Community
- _____ Curriculum support
- _____ Personnel policies
- _____ Inservice Training and Teacher Development

Program Evaluation For Bilingual Education

- _____ Evaluation of Students
- _____ Evaluation of Teachers
- _____ Evaluation of Program
- _____ Evaluation of Parent Advisory Council
- _____ Evaluation of Administrators
- _____ Evaluation of Objectives for Curriculum
- _____ Evaluation of Community

SECTION IV

If you have time, please comment on any aspect of bilingual education by writing your comments below.

APPENDIX B

BILINGUAL PROJECTS PARTICIPATING IN STUDY

BILINGUAL PROJECTS PARTICIPATING IN STUDY

1. ABC Unified School District - Cerritos, California
 2. Alice Independent School District - Alice, Texas
 3. Bilingual Education Program - Columbus, Georgia
 4. Bishop Consolidated Independent School District - Bishop, Texas
 5. Buffalo Public School System - Buffalo, New York
 6. Dallas Independent School District - Dallas, Texas
 7. Educational Service District # 123 - Pasco, Washington
 8. El Paso Public Schools - El Paso, Texas
 9. Grand Rapids Public Schools - El Paso, Texas
 10. Hacienda La Puente Unified School District - La Puente, California
 11. Jefferson Parish School Board - Gretna, Louisiana
 12. Laredo Independent School District - Laredo, Texas
 13. Lyford Consolidated Unified School District - Lyford, Texas
 14. Murphy Elementary District No. 21 - Phoenix, Arizona
 15. Palm Springs Unified School District - Palm Springs, California
 16. Plainview Independent School District - Plainview, Texas
 17. Santa Barbara School District - Santa Barbara, California
 18. Socorro Consolidated Schools - Socorro, New Mexico
 19. Southside Independent School District - San Antonio, Texas
 20. St. Vrain Valley School District - Longmont, Colorado
 21. Sunnyvale School District - Sunnyvale, California
- N.B. Randomly selected projects.

APPENDIX C
COVER LETTERS TO RESEARCH SUBJECTS

March 31, 1978

Dear

I am involved in a study which should be of interest to you and your colleagues. Your assistance is of vital importance if the study is to be completed.

The purpose of the study is to identify and examine the roles and functions of Parent Advisory Councils in their service to Bilingual Projects funded under ESEA Title VII. The organizational aspects of advisory councils will also be included in the study.

You have been randomly selected to participate in this study. I would appreciate it greatly if you would take a few minutes of your time to complete the questionnaire. The first part of the questionnaire is general information and the second section related to roles and functions of Parent Advisory Councils. Each role and function is to be ranked according to importance. The rankings of roles and functions will assist me in the development of an ideal model for Parent Advisory Councils serving Bilingual Education Projects.

The study will not identify a respondent by name or school system. Data obtained will only be used for analysis of roles and functions of Parent Advisory Councils. Should you have any questions relating to the intent of the study, please contact me at the address given above or by calling at (703) 471-4600. I invite and solicit any comments you find may be pertinent to this study.

Please return the questionnaire in the self-addressed envelope as soon as possible. Your help with this study will be greatly appreciated.

Yours truly,

Norberto Cruz, Jr.

March 31, 1978

Dear

I am requesting your assistance in completing the questionnaire which Norberto Cruz, Jr. has sent you. Mr. Cruz is a graduate student at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and presently is doing research on Parent Advisory Councils serving Bilingual Education Projects funded under ESEA Title VII.

The research which Mr. Cruz has undertaken is specifically concerned with the roles and functions of Parent Advisory Councils in Bilingual Projects. It is the intent of Mr. Cruz to survey persons such as yourself in order to obtain the needed data. You have been selected as a participant in the study because it is believed that you have one of the closest working relationships with the Parent Advisory Council and thus can provide the most accurate information.

The study will be beneficial in several areas: The Parent Advisory Councils in Bilingual Projects will directly benefit from the development of a general model of roles and functions; the Bilingual Projects will also benefit from a more organized formulation of roles and functions of Parent Advisory Councils.

I assure you that there will be no identification of respondents or school systems in the study. The data received will be utilized for research purposes and answers will be in aggregate form. Should you have any questions concerning the intent of the study, please feel free to contact me by writing to the above address or by calling me at (703) 471-4600.

Your assistance in the study will be deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

Donald K. Sharpes, PhD
Associate Professor of Education

April 10, 1978

Dear

On March 31, 1978, I sent you a letter and questionnaire requesting your help with a study I was conducting. It is my belief that your information can greatly benefit the Parent Advisory Councils in Bilingual Education. There is concern among educators, citizens and government officials over the roles and functions of advisory councils. Along with the concern comes criticism that advisory councils do not know how to function. If roles and functions of parent advisory councils are to be developed, it is imperative that information from persons such as yourself, with close working relationships with the council, be surveyed.

I again solicit your help and request that you complete the questionnaire and return it to me as soon as possible. For your convenience, a questionnaire and self-addressed stamped envelope are enclosed.

The study will not identify a respondent by name or a school system. Data obtained will only be used for the analysis of roles and functions of parent advisory councils. Should you have any questions relating to the intent of the study, please contact me at (703) 471-4600, Ext. 24.

Your cooperation and assistance is deeply appreciated.

Yours truly,

Norberto Cruz, Jr.

April 18, 1978

Dear

On March 31 and April 10, I sent you a letter and questionnaire requesting your help with a study I was conducting. I need your assistance in completing this important research in Bilingual Education. It is my belief that your information can greatly benefit the Parent Advisory Councils in Bilingual Education. There is concern among educators, citizens and government officials over the roles and functions of advisory councils. Along with the concern comes criticism that advisory councils do not know how to function. If roles and functions of parent advisory councils are to be developed, it is imperative that information from persons such as yourself, with close working relationships with the council, be surveyed.

I again solicit your help and request that you complete the questionnaire and return it to me as soon as possible. For your convenience, a questionnaire and self-addressed envelope are enclosed.

Please be assured that no attempt will be made to identify a respondent by name or a school system. Data obtained will only be used for the analysis of roles and functions of parent advisory councils. Should you have any questions relating to the intent of the study, please contact me at (703) 471-4600 extension #24.

Please mail the questionnaire by April 26. Your cooperation and assistance are deeply appreciated.

Yours truly,

Norberto Cruz, Jr.

**The two page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 1 of 2**

**The two page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 2 of 2**

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE ROLES AND FUNCTIONS
OF PARENT ADVISORY COUNCILS SERVING
SPANISH-ENGLISH BILINGUAL PROJECTS
FUNDED UNDER ESEA TITLE VII

by

Norberto Cruz, Jr.

(ABSTRACT)

The purpose of this study was to identify and examine the roles and functions of parent advisory councils serving Spanish-English bilingual projects funded under ESEA Title VII. It was also the intent of this study to determine if there existed significant differences on the ranking of roles and functions by the participants with respect to the specified variables of: position of participant, sex, age level, education level, bilingualism and ethnicity. The roles and functions under the program areas of planning, implementation and evaluation were identified through an extensive review of the literature. Twenty-one Spanish-English bilingual projects with grades Kindergarten through eight, funded under ESEA Title VII, were randomly selected from Guide To Title VII ESEA Bilingual-Bicultural Programs 1976-1977. The participants from these bilingual projects were advisory council chairpersons, principals and project directors.

The research instrument developed was a questionnaire which solicited from the participants demographic information on the advisory

councils and also asked participants to rank, according to primacy, roles and functions under the program areas of planning, implementation and evaluation.

The data were analyzed by the Kendall Coefficient of Concordance W and Multivariate Analysis. The .05 level of significance was chosen for both tests.

The results indicated that there existed a high degree of agreement within each group of respondents on the ranking of roles and functions. The only exception was a low degree of agreement by chairpersons ranking functions under evaluation. The results also showed that the independent variables identified made no difference on the ranking of roles and functions. The only exception was the sex variable on the ranking of roles. Male respondents ranked the roles of advisor, supporter and director first, second and third respectively, while female respondents ranked the roles of supporter, director and advisory first, second and third respectively.